

# ENGLISH STUDIES

A JOURNAL OF ENGLISH  
LETTERS AND PHILOLOGY

Edited

in collaboration with EILERT EKWALL, Lund,  
BERNHARD FEHR, Zürich, and H. LÜDEKE, Basel,

by

R. W. ZANDVOORT

THE HAGUE

1937

19-20  
1937-38

VOLUME NINETEEN

===== NOS 1-6 =====

---

N.V. SWETS & ZEITLINGER - Keizersgracht 471 - AMSTERDAM  
C. W. K. GLEERUP, LUND — MAX NIEHANS, ZÜRICH

# CONTENTS

## ARTICLES

		Page
FEHR, B.,	The Antagonism of Forms in the Eighteenth Century	1, 49
GARDINER, A. H.,	Linguistic Theory: Reply to some Critics	58
KIRCHNER, G.,	The Verbs with Direct and Indirect Object Re-examined	97
MALONE, K.,	The Tale of Geat and Mæðhild	193
VAN DER VAT, D. G.,	Paternity in <i>Ulysses</i>	145
WILDI M.,	The Birth of Expressionism in the Work of D. H. Lawrence	241

## REVIEWS

Adams, J. T.,	Henry Adams (H. LÜDEKE)	270
Anderson, A. O.(ed.),	The Chronicle of Melrose (L. BRUMMEL)	26
Audra, E.,	L'Influence française dans l'Œuvre de Pope (M. PRAZ)	77
Ault, N. (ed.),	Pope's Own Miscellany (M. PRAZ)	77
Bagdasarianz, W.,	William Blake (F. T. WOOD)	82
Baugh, A. C.,	A History of the English Language (R. W. ZANDVOORT)	90
Berendsohn, W. A.,	Zur Vorgeschichte des <i>Beowulf</i> (K. MALONE)	24
Blass, A.,	Die Geschichtsauffassung Daniel Defoes (R. STAMM)	36
Byles, A. T. P. (ed.),	<i>The Book of Fayttes of Armes and of Chyualrye</i> (E. EKWALL)	214
Denkinger, E. M.,	Philip Sidney (R. W. ZANDVOORT)	266
Eaton, H. A.,	Thomas De Quincey (M. PRAZ)	179
Ekwall, E.,	The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names (J MANSION)	172
Fettig, A.,	Die Gradadverbien im Mittelenglischen (O. S. ANDERSON)	176
Follett, W. (ed.),	The Collected Poems of Stephen Crane (H. LÜDEKE)	271
Funke, O.,	Englische Sprachphilosophie im spätern 18. Jahrhundert (H. STRAUMANN)	40
Goldman, M. S.,	Sir Philip Sidney and the <i>Arcadia</i> (R. W. ZANDVOORT)	266
Greenlaw, E., and others (edds.),	The Works of Edmund Spenser, Vols. III, IV, V (A. G. VAN KRANENDONK)	72
Grierson, H. J. C.,	Milton and Wordsworth, Poets and Prophets (J. KOOISTRA)	122
————— (ed.),	The Letters of Sir Walter Scott, Vols. IX, X (J. A. FALCONER)	125



Gutkess, W.,	Jerome K. Jerome (C. A. BODELSEN)	269
Herford, C. H. (ed.),	Ben Jonson, Vol. V	226
Hofstrand, G.,	<i>The Seege of Troy</i> (A. KIHLEBOM)	27
House, H. (ed.),	The Note-Books and Papers of Gerard Manley Hopkins (L. FORSTER)	236
Hudson, H. H. (ed.),	Hoskins' <i>Directions for Speech and Style</i> (R. W. ZANDVOORT)	177
Jenkins, H.,	The Life and Work of Henry Chettle (P. J. H. O. SCHUT)	75
Jespersen, O.,	Growth and Structure of the English Language, 8th ed. (R. W. ZANDVOORT)	90
Jones, D.,	An English Pronouncing Dictionary, 4th ed. (M. SCHUBIGER)	183
Kölbing, E. (ed.),	<i>The Siege of Jerusalem</i> (E. EKWALL)	214
Lathrop, H. B.,	Translations from the Classics into English from Caxton to Chapman (TH. WEEVERS)	223
Lehnert, M.,	Die Grammatik des englischen Sprachmeisters John Wallis (E. EKWALL)	87
Llewellyn, E. C.,	The Influence of Low Dutch on the English Vocabulary (J. F. BENISE)	165
Malone, K. (ed.),	<i>Widsith</i> (W. FISCHER)	211
Meier, A.,	Die alttestamentliche Namengebung in England (O. S. ANDERSON)	35
Myrick, K. O.,	Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman (R. W. ZANDVOORT)	266
Neuschäffer, W.,	Dostojewskijs Einfluss auf den englischen Roman (R. STAMM)	84
Osborn, A. W.,	Sir Philip Sidney en France (R. W. ZANDVOORT)	266
Padelford, F.M.(ed.),	The <i>Axiochus</i> of Plato, tr. by E. Spenser (A. G. VAN KRANENDONK)	72
Pennink, R.,	Nederland en Shakespeare (C. A. ZAALBERG)	233
del Re, A.,	<i>Florio's First Fruites</i> (M. PRAZ)	226
Seaton, E.,	Literary Relations of England and Scandinavia in the Seventeenth Century (G. AHLSTRÖM)	32
Sehlbach, H.,	Untersuchungen über die Romankunst von Wilkie Collins (C. A. BODELSEN)	268
Seillière, E.,	David-Herbert Lawrence et les récentes idéologies allemandes (H. W. HÄUSERMANN)	86
Sells, I. E.,	Matthew Arnold en France (K.R.GALLAS)	43
Sharpe, R. B.,	The Real War of the Theatres (M. PRAZ)	226
Sherburn, G.,	The Early Career of Alexander Pope (M. PRAZ)	77
Smith, C. G.,	Spenser's Theory of Friendship (A. G. VAN KRANENDONK)	72
Stamm, R.,	Der Aufgeklärte Puritanismus Daniel Defoes (G. ROORDA)	39

	Page
Stein, H.,	Studies in Spenser's <i>Complaints</i> (A. G. VAN KRANENDONK) 72
von Stutterheim, K.,	England, Heute und Morgen (J. H. HUIZINGA) 131
O'Sullivan, M. J. (ed.),	<i>Firumbras and Otuel and Roland</i> (E. EKWALL) 214
Tenney, E. A.,	Thomas Lodge (M. PRAZ) 226
Tillyard, E. M. W.,	The English Epic Tradition (R. W. ZANDVOORT) 266
Vail, C. C. D.,	Lessing's Relation to the English Language and Literature (L. POLAK) 234
van der Vat, D. G.,	The Fabulous Opera (M. PRAZ) 128
Walraf, E.,	Soziale Lyrik in England, 1880—1914 (M. WILDI) 129
Warren, C. H.,	Sir Philip Sidney (R. W. ZANDVOORT) 266
West, E. S.,	A Flame in Sunlight. The Life and Work of Thomas De Quincey (M. PRAZ) 179
West, V. R.,	Der etymologische Ursprung der neu- englischen Lautgruppe [sk] (E. EKWALL) 174
Wurtsbaugh, J.,	Two Centuries of Spenserian Scholarship (1609—1805) (A. G. VAN KRANENDONK) 72
Zettl, E. (ed.),	An Anonymous Short English Metrical Chronicle (E. EKWALL) 214

## MISCELLANEOUS

### Current Literature: 1936 (F. T. WOOD)

II. Fiction, Poetry and Drama

133, 186

II. Criticism and Biography

272

### Notes and News

Bazell, C. E., Notes on Synchronic Grammar. (i) Case in English, 20. — Id., (ii) The Phono-Semantic Parallel, 204. — Bodelsen, C. A., The Red White and Blue, 158. — Bøgholm, N., Vocabulary and Style of the Middle English *Ancrene Riwe*, 113. — Bonnard, G., Shakespeare's Contribution to R. Chester's *Love's Martyr*, 66. — Ekwall, E., R. E. Zachrisson †, 209. — Gilomen, W., George Moore and his Friendship with W. B. Yeats, 116. — Hensch, A. L., A Survival of *it is* = *there is*, 209. — Jespersen, O., Voicing of Spirants in English, 69. — King, A. H., Notes on *Coriolanus*, 13. — Koszul, A., "Ariel", 200. — Lawson, R., Lucio, in *Measure for Measure*, 259. — Magoun, F. P., Jr., *Sir Gawain* and Medieval Football. — Malone, K., Some *Widsith* Notes, 264. Anglo-Norman Text Society, 71. — A New History of English Literature, 72. — In Memoriam H. Poutsma, 120. — English Studies in Switzerland, 122. English Studies at Amsterdam, 165. — England To-day and To-morrow, 165. — Corrigendum, 165. — English Studies at Groningen, 211. — Forthcoming Contributions, 211. — In Memoriam W. van der Gaaf, L. P. H. Eijkman, Jos. Mansion, Emile Legouis, 265.

### Brief Mention

94, 191, 286

### Bibliography

45, 95, 142, 191, 239, 287



# The Antagonism of Forms in the Eighteenth Century (III)

## The New Outlook about 1790

If we shift our ground from about 1760 — where we stood not long ago — to 1790, which we will look upon as a chronological token for the years 1780 to 1810, we find that the general view in literature and the fine arts has greatly changed. It has become a literary habit to call this changed view the Romantic Movement and to bring down the wealth of phenomena coming and going in those days to a common denominator, the Romantic. To avoid confusion we will not make use any more of this completely defaced coin.<sup>33</sup> We will simply state that the multitude of forms in those days seems to run between two opposing poles. We noted above (XVIII, 118) that there was still an architectural classicism highly respected in influential quarters. But we meet it again in painting. Right at the other end there is an ever increasing tendency towards the free and easy, towards naturalism in poetry, in painting, in gardening, in architecture. And between those two poles we are to imagine a scale of innumerable shades. Somewhere in the middle the Baroque with its terrific and its sublime finds itself continued. But the Baroque has ceased to be the exclusive emotional fashion, it has, with the growth of new neighbours, fallen into place in a bigger company.

We will now pass in review the pageant of forms in architecture, painting, gardening, aesthetic theory and literature. By extending our investigation to the fine arts we hope to arrive at a more realistic and less metaphysical conception as to the nature of so-called romantic literature.

## The Gothic Revival in Architecture

We need not dwell on the classicistic triumph so successfully maintained by the brothers Adam and their followers (s. above, XVIII, 118). One thing seemed certain: Classicism, having arrived at its latest stage of frozen correctness, was not willing to open the door to the Baroque a

---

<sup>33</sup> which has come to stand for a sort of tweedledum playing a rather unfair game against a tweedledee, classicism, which all through the game, at least as far as literature is concerned, is not there. The writer is aware of the fact that he has given orthodox definitions of the Romantic in his two volumes on English literature. But seeing that for many scholars the Romantic has become a thing to be hunted for in authors he considers it wiser not to follow a will-o'-the-wisp and to stay with the facts. — There is an interesting programmatic entry in Hugo von Hoffmannsthal's *Tagebüchern* under Nov. 23d 1906 (*Corona*, VI, Heft 5, 1936, p. 589): Ein Aufsatz: Vorschlag, den Namen Romantik ausser Gebrauch zu setzen. (Motivierung: Mit dem Worte Romantik haben die Dichter jener Epoche sich selbst eine Atmosphäre suggeriert, worin aber das, worauf es einzig ankommt, das Einmalige, Nie-Wiederkehrende, das Besondere verschleiert wird. Das Vage, Unzulängliche, in allen Gleiche, das Unbestimmte, das worüber sich viele verständigen konnten, drängt sich vor und verschleiert die Idee jedes Einzelnen.) — "The Romantic Age" etc. is a convenient label for 1780-1830.

second time. So if the dynamic was to have another chance it had to look about for a new formal apparatus. It found it in the Gothic. This marks the beginning of the so-called Gothic revival in the 18th century. This passing over from Palladianism to Gothicism is usually explained as a re-assertion of the old native English style which had continued through the 16th and 17th centuries and had never died out. But this does not account for the supremacy of classicism in the early 18th century when people had no eyes for the glories of great cathedrals such as Salisbury, Exeter or Durham and for the delicately woven tracery of St. George's chapel in Windsor, the Chapel of King's College, Cambridge, or Henry VII's chapel in Westminster Abbey.

Sporadic outbursts of the Gothic in the first third of the century are extremely rare. We have an example in the tiny Gothic temple in Shotover Park. It was very likely built by Nicholas Hawksmoor under the influence of Vanbrugh, who loved to combine his Baroque with the Gothic (cf. above, XVIII, 121-2). "The function of that Gothic temple was to stress barbarous "irregularity" in opposition to the classic beauty of the obelisk and the regularity of the cube-like house."<sup>34</sup>

But otherwise the Gothic was held in contempt. The younger Christopher Wren's memoirs may be taken as voicing the general opinion about 1730, when against the beauties of the Classic he was setting the uglinesses of the Gothic:

If after he has looked a while upon King Henry VII's chapel at Westminster, gazed on its sharp angles, jetties, narrow lights, lame statues, lace, and other cut-work, and crinkle-cranle, and then shall turn his eyes on the banquetting hall built at Whitehall by Inigo Jones, after the ancient manner; or on what his Majesty's surveyor Sir Christopher Wren, has advanced at St. Paul's, and consider what a glorious object the cupola, Porticos, colonnades, and other parts present to the beholder ... and then pronounce which of the two manners strikes the understanding as well as the eyes, with the more majesty and solemn greatness ... (there can be no doubt about the answer. And then consider) the universal and unreasonable thickness of the walls, clumsy buttresses, towers, sharp-pointed arches, doors, and other apertures, without proportion. Nonsensical insertions of various marbles impertinently placed; Turrets and pinnacles thick set with monies and chimeras, and abundance of busy work and other incongruities dissipate and break the angles of the sight, and so confound it, that one cannot consider it with any steadiness, where to begin or end. ...<sup>35</sup>

Classic snobbery could not go any further. Yet within twenty years of this what a change! Beside classic mania a Gothic mania! Thomas Warton thought he could discover the Gothic in the Fairy Queen. Thomas Gray began to admire the cathedrals and to mention them in his letters. His great friend, Horace Walpole, before realizing his dream of a Gothic castle in brick and mortar — Strawberry Hill, from 1760 onward — was a fanatic devotee of the Gothic. His eye was fixed on specimens of late perpendicular Gothic such as King's College Chapel, Cambridge, founded by Henry VI, with its elaborate fan-vaulting and tracery so delicate as if it had been knitted together by "the fingers of angels". So it was on this latest phase of the English style that the revival concentrated its efforts of incompetent imitation — as is shown by Straw-

<sup>34</sup> Tipping, *English Homes*, IV, II, 248-251.

<sup>35</sup> Christopher Wren, *Life and Works of Sir C. Wren, from the Parentalia or Memoirs by his son C. W.*, p. 175.



berry Hill.<sup>36</sup> It was not until James Wyatt<sup>37</sup> had partially mastered the technique of the Gothic that results were obtained that seemed acceptable from the architect's point of view. Of this, Ashridge Park, which he built about 1816, is a good example. The gigantic Fonthill Abbey, which he began to shape some twenty years before according to the desires of William Beckford, the fantastic worshipper of the Portuguese abbeys Alcobaça and Batalha, was as near a likeness of an abbey with an abbey church as was possible under the circumstances. That its tower collapsed in 1825 involving almost all the rest in its ruin was due to the unscrupulousness of the clerk of the works and to lack of skilled workers.

In the meanwhile the Gothicising, Castleising and Abbeyising had been in full swing both in life and in literature and, as a consequence, Gothic fanaticism turned nationalistic. It claimed England as the fount and origin of Gothic architecture. Rheims and Chartres were imitations of English cathedrals, a fiction which an enthusiast such as Milner<sup>38</sup> would obstinately cling to even after a young clergyman, G. D. Whittington (d. 1807), as a result of his scholarly investigations, had proved the priority of Continental Gothic.<sup>39</sup>

When an admirer of King's College Chapel, Cambridge,<sup>40</sup> glorified its beauties in the following lines:

When Henry bade this pompous temple rise,  
Nor with presumption emulate the skies,  
Art and Palladio had not reached the land,  
Nor methodized the Vandal builder's hand;  
Wonders unknown to rule these piles disclose;  
The walls as if by inspiration rose

he was uttering an error with regard to the nature of Gothic — "wonders unknown to rule" — which was universal in the heyday of the revival. The Gothic enthusiasts would unduly stress the irregularity and absence of rules in the Gothic, where, on the contrary, there was regularity but of a kind different from that of the classic, and an obedience to rules of a more complicated nature. Even an admirer like Thomas Warton would speak of the Gothic as "richly rude", a strange notion if we consider the refinement of Gothic tracery. The enthusiasts were unable to experience the Gothic in any other than the emotional, the sentimental way. They were, moreover, obsessed by the idea that the Gothic was the truest

<sup>36</sup> About Horace Walpole and the Gothic consult: Paul Yvon, *Le gothique et la renaissance gothique en Angleterre 1750-1880*, Paris 1931. — About the Gothic revival in general: Kenneth Clark, *The Gothic Revival*, Constable 1928, (the earliest survey of importance); Christopher Hussey, *The Picturesque*, Putnam, 1927 (The "picturesque" in this penetrative study is taken in a widened sense. If we add to what we called the "painterly" (XVIII, 116) the "picturesque" in its limited sense we get Hussey's conception), Tipping, *English Homes VI*; Peter Burra, *Baroque and Gothic Sentimentalists*, Duckworth 1932; W. H. Smith, *Architecture in English Fiction*, New Haven, 1924 (a good book).

<sup>37</sup> Cf. now Antony Dale, *James Wyatt, Architect 1746-1813*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1936.

<sup>38</sup> John Milner, *A Treatise on the Ecclesiastical Architecture of England during the Middle Ages*, 1811.

<sup>39</sup> G. D. Whittington, *An Historical Survey of the Ecclesiastical Antiquities of France ...* 1809.

<sup>40</sup> quoted by Willson and Pugin, *Specimens of Gothic Architecture*, 1821, p. XIV. The authors mention Thomas Gray and Horace Walpole in connection with the above quotation. I have, fortunately, not been able to trace it in Gray's work.



expression of the natural. Gothic pinnacles and buttresses striving upward appeared to them like the intermingling tree-tops of forest avenues. They were able to recognize landscape features in Gothic buildings and, conversely, Gothic shapes seemed to greet them in their wanderings through woodland and mountain scenery.<sup>41</sup> A print of an Alpine scene by the engraver James Basire forming the title-page to George Keate's *Alps* (in the edition of 1781)<sup>42</sup> exhibits an amusing congregation of trees, rocks and peaks, all in the likeness of Gothic cathedral towers.

In this way, owing to an error of judgment due to an inadequate knowledge of the facts, the Gothic was looked upon as the architectural correspondence to the free and easy in nature. But towards the end of the century these false associations began one by one to be removed from the Gothic, so that henceforth it was more and more valued for its own sake and from an architectural point of view.

### Classic Painting and Landscape Painting

In painting, the two poles, classicism and naturalism, are clearly marked. But here again classic painting was going through the same freezing process as classic architecture. The output of allegorical, mythological and historical pictures both ancient and modern was enormous, and so was the number of native artists turning out the pictorial articles that were so much in demand in those days: Benjamin West, James Barry, John Copley, James Northcote, Joseph Wright, J. H. Mortimer, William Etty, B. R. Haydon, Robert Smirke, David Wilkie etc. etc. But their art was of a mediocre kind. We notice exceptions. There were hidden possibilities in Thomas Stodhard, a painter of classic subjects, where the figures seem to have walked out of marble friezes into the picture frame, and an illustrator of Thomson's *Seasons* and the novels of Richardson, full of variety, with memories of Watteau and Boucher. There was Flaxman, famous for his illustrations to the tragedies of Aeschylus, classical in subject, anti-classical in treatment. There was William Blake with his passion for Michelangesque attitudes, and his friend the "mad Swissman", Fuseli, who would fill a classical frame work with most phantastic but powerful episodes.

Neither was England more fortunate in those foreign artists whom she called in to support the classic tradition. For Angelica Kaufmann and her later husband J. B. Cipriani, Antonio Zucchi and Biagio Rebbeca had soon exhausted their allegorical, mythological and historical repertory, and their best work consisted in the painting of decorative panels, round, oblong and rhomboid for the interiors of the super-classicalised aristocratic homes of those days.

As against this classicism which was kept alive mechanically and professionally, there was the true native tendency towards a far-off aim, an unaffected naturalism. The realisation of this tendency implied the removal of two chief hindrances: emotions of the merely fashionable kind and fashionable mannerisms. English artists were perhaps the first

<sup>41</sup> W. H. Smith, l.c. p. 16.

<sup>42</sup> Reproduced in R. Spindler, *Die Alpen in der Englischen Literatur und Kunst*, Tauchnitz, Leipzig, 1932, p. 6.



to de-emotionalize their portraits by showing their noblemen and aristocratic ladies free from the manneristic and coquettish poses in favour on the continent and by exhibiting the charms of their personalities against the congenial background of English parks. And here we must think less of Reynolds, who had a tendency to generalize, or of Romney, who was a lover of the pose, than of Gainsborough, who when painting the portrait of a pompous duchess was not satisfied unless he could "realise her as a woman."

But it seemed far more difficult to de-emotionalize the landscape and to unburden it of those human figures always eager to impart their pathetic tone to the scene surrounding them. It was all the more difficult as the cult of emotions of a milder kind, sensibility, had received the sanction of middle-class morality. But there was a second difficulty. Through the 18th century domination by rules it had become habitual to look at any landscape through the memories of Poussin, Claude, Rosa and even Rubens with their preconceived, studio-bound designs, either grandly pathetic, serenely smiling, or operatic, no matter how far the falsifying of the English scene as regarded truth of mood or even colour might proceed. (If such a painter had spread his brown tints across his arid foregrounds between bistre side-screens, no power on earth could force an amateur to do as much as even glance at the light greenery of an English landscape.) The emotionalized landscape had thus crystallized into stereotyped compositional patterns: a Rubens pattern, a Poussin pattern, a Claude pattern, a Rosa pattern, the halfway English pattern of Richard Wilson, who in his earlier career attempted to apply the Claude formula to the English landscape.

It was against these two fashions of the day, sensibility and traditional landscape patterns, that the native genius of English painting directed its attack. It found guidance in the Dutch tradition, in Ruysdael and Hobbema. But, first of all, it relied for its reform on its innate good sense of fact. The result was a compromise, a naturalism expressive of a gliding scale of moods varying with the individual painter, either faintly or strongly affected according to the innate temper of the artist. And the painter's mastery of composition would reveal itself in his art of hiding it.

The English painter who was the first to turn away from patterns was Thomas Gainsborough (1727-1788). He started from two quarters. Technically he was at first dependent on the Baroque landscape of Rubens with its movement, wealth and glories of life — which was a pattern; as to substance, however, he started from the beauties of his native East Anglia — which was not a pattern but a piece of reality. Gainsborough was at his best as long as he was allowed to move in the fulness of that reality, in his Ipswich period, which lasted till 1760.<sup>43</sup> It was then that he painted his "Drinkstone Park", which is a landscape painted for what, in its unconventional language, it had to communicate to him and not as a scene for a human episode. But "his song was cut short. That is the tragedy of Gainsborough." He went to Bath to earn a living as a portrait painter and then in 1774 to London. Here he stiffened into professionalism, here he turned his landscapes into backgrounds.

Where then did Gainsborough stop short of further development in English realism? His colour technique does not allow the distinguishing

<sup>43</sup> Clive Bell, *The Tragedy of G.* — *Lister* XV (1936) p. 375-378.



of what the French call "valeurs", the registering of the various shades of one colour, the painting, for instance, of green on green on green to enhance our sense of reality, — what Constable achieved, what the Barbizon school exulted in.

Gainsborough's early naturalism in oil painting did not find a continuator, for when John Crome (1769-1821), the other East Anglian master artist, exhibited his "Mousehold Heath" it became evident that pictorial naturalism had in the intervening forty years advanced in gigantic strides. "Mousehold Heath" was painted for "air and space"<sup>44</sup> and the apparently commonplace features of the heath with its rough road toiling across in a spirit of inevitability. So something must have happened in the meanwhile. We know that Gainsborough might, if he was going to paint a landscape for its own sake and for his private pleasure, take to water-colour, which very likely seemed to him a fitter instrument for the true rendering of the mysterious play of colour and light and of the moistness of his native Norfolk. Just about that time another artist began to paint spring skies and flower gardens in the new medium, which forced him to leave the studio and to produce faithful pictures directly from nature: Paul Sandby (1728-88), the father of English water-colour. He was, besides, a painter in oil and an engraver who for some time was attached to the army as a draughtsman of maps and plans. When he worked for engraving his technique would become cold and dry, of the hardness of precision; but it was a useful medium for topography, which in those pre-photographic days was turning out "views" or "prospects" by the hundred, — a local landscape portraiture which was artificially enlivened by the introduction of human scenes. A typical example is afforded by Paul Sandby's "Views of Wales", 1776. Touring having become fashionable, travellers were delighted to buy those views not only as souvenirs of the landscape beauties they themselves had admired, but as representations of pleasing human and animal scenes with anglers and other figures, horses, coaches, and vehicles of all kinds, and cattle.

Sandby had a contemporary whose name is now forgotten. He created an unaffected landscape portraiture and raised it to the rank of a high art: Francis Towne, from Devonshire (born 1740).<sup>45</sup> He achieved for landscape painting what no artist had done before. Having divested a natural scene of all its unessential details he wrenched from it and stressed its structural secret. A Swiss glacier painted by Towne reveals an almost intellectual penetration into the workings of the architectural laws of the Alpine world. Towne stands out as a unique figure in his age, and his place is nearest to that pole — unaffected naturalism — which was a far-off aim, impossible to attain in those days when sensibility was looked upon as a social virtue.

For in England the human aspects of Rembrandt, Rubens and Claude could never be forgotten. Two artists, father and son, Alexander Cozens (1701-1786) and John Robert Cozens (1770-1799) had

<sup>44</sup> This was in the nature of a discovery. An art critic, Henry Richter, years later, gave his book this significant title: *Daylight, a recent discovery in the art of painting*, 1817.

<sup>45</sup> Laurence Binyon, *Landscape in English Art and Poetry*, Cobden-Sanderson, 1931, p. 89-95. This excellent little book by an authority brings well selected illustrations of paintings. But it is a pity that owing to the fact that the printing had to be done in Japan some of the reproductions are rather poor.



during their studies in Italy come in touch with the still surviving Claudian style. So with Claude's irrational elements (s. XVIII, 204), which were in danger of getting lost to English art, viz. moving prospects, filtering light, the emotional appeal, and the rational element of composition, they combined their innate closer observation of the facts of nature. This meant that English water-colour came to stand for a faithful naturalism subject to a mood, not simply taken over from the collective emotional fashion of the day, but a mood inherent to the scene at a given moment. Henceforth water-colour was no longer an auxiliary art, it came to be looked upon as the national English art, able to express the very genius of the English landscape and to achieve the greatest naturalist triumph, that is, to create a scale of "valeurs" (s. above p. 6), the painting of the various notes of atmospheric light, to become identical in the end with that new mode of seeing things which was in the nature of a decisive turn, similar in its newness to the famous transition from Renaissance to Baroque.

The small band of English water-colour painters grew larger and larger. We will only mention the greatest names: Thomas Girtin (1775-1803), John Varley (1778-1842), J. S. Cotman (1782-1842), David Cox (1783-1859), Peter de Wint (1784-1849), Copley Fielding (1787-1885), John Constable (1776-1837) (who, however, painted more naturally in oils) and William Turner (1775-1851). In the new century they were famous all over Europe for their views taken from nature. The French recognized their superiority. They were pleased to buy Girtin's "Views of the Seine" (1803) and J. C. Nattes' "Drawings made on the Spot" (1804). To their countrymen the water-colourists showed that the grandest subjects, the sea and mountain scenery, were not beyond their ability, although they might simultaneously prove to the world — what Old Crome was striving for in the same hour — that an "uninteresting" landscape — or "unromantic" as later criticism would call it — was just as fascinating if seen through the painter's eye.

Surveying the enormous bulk of their work we are struck from time to time by the antagonism between design and freedom. J. R. Cozens' picture of Flüelen on the lake of Lucerne (1776)<sup>46</sup> is, though drawn from nature, a pattern, — the same Cozens who in his advanced work could convey the mystery of distance and amplitude and the grandeur of freedom. The same applies to certain stratified paintings by Cotman: "Greta Bridge", "The Waterfall", by the side of his wonders of sky, water, moistness, and leafage like "Dewy Eve" or "Shadowed Stream" or that symphony of shadow, sunshine and movement "Breaking the Clod". Cox and Peter de Wint exhibit equal antagonisms and equal triumphs.<sup>47</sup> Even the great Turner, who went beyond the aims of the water-colour painters, in his earliest attempts might succumb to a pattern, distinctly so in his "Chamonix, Mer de Glace" (1803-4),<sup>48</sup> which is haunted by the ghost of Salvator Rosa.

The new mode of seeing was closely observed by a young Frenchman who in 1795 was staying as an exile at Beccles near Norwich: Chateau-

<sup>46</sup> Reproduced by Spindler, l.c. p. 8.

<sup>47</sup> We refer to the Special Summer Number of the *Studio*, 1903: *Masters of English Landscape Painting*: J. S. Cotman, David Cox, Peter de Wint. It is richly illustrated and contains introductions, of which the one to Cotman by Laurence Binyon is of great help.

<sup>48</sup> Reproduced by Spindler l.c. p. 12.

briand.<sup>49</sup> Whoever reads the primeval scenes of his *Voyages en Amérique*, written not beyond the seas but in his quiet Norfolk retreat, will be struck by the presence of "valeurs" of which the atmosphere of East Anglia surrounding him was full<sup>50</sup> and which, whilst they were seized upon by Cotman, Cox, Constable, the observant Frenchman was eager to turn to literary account.

Only ten years separated him from the absolute mastery of "valeurs" achieved by Constable and the atmospheric visions of Turner, two young painters of almost the same age.

But Turner (1775-1851), the more ambitious of the two, spent years and years in acquiring full command of all the technical tricks worth having by extracting the secrets from Cuyp, Van de Velde and Claude in an uninterrupted practice, which at his death left the English nation in the possession of three hundred pictures and some twenty thousand drawings by his hand so that the fulness of his experience as a painter was not realised before the eighteen forties. All his preceding activity had been a strenuous endeavouring towards the final heights when, with the concentrated knowledge of a life-time, Turner was enabled to build his "golden visions" out of that fluid element, light, which for him contained everything, sun, air, and sea. It seemed impossible to carry a painter's homage to the clouds any further.

Constable, seeing the "golden visions" — the expression was his own — must have been aware of the long distances his contemporary, who, on the same morning, had set out from the same station, had run in advance of him. But Constable might argue that his own mastery of the atmosphere was just as complete. Did not his countrymen begin to speak of a "Constable sky" and was it not Fuseli who had said that in front of a Constable picture you felt inclined to open your umbrella, a joke which implied the highest praise? Constable's pictorial truth was a double truth, it was the affirmation of what he had seen with his eyes, which never played him false, and of his emotion in experiencing a landscape; because for him, he said, painting and feeling were two words for the same thing. Thus Constable, in the end, became the painter of the hour. He would paint the same scene over and over again as the light changed. The colour harmony might alter from hour to hour, the sky would by shifting the tonic transpose the chord. Why should he become a transformer like Turner by attempting to be more than the true interpreter of the English atmosphere, out of which, if he saw it truthfully, he was able to lift everything: form, composition, the appeal to the senses and to the emotions?

One should never speak of the glories of the so-called Romantic period in literature without doing justice to those two great men, both of them first revealers of the elusive elements in the English atmosphere, of that incessant game carried on by light and air with natural objects, by those sportive twin brothers who, never willing to leave things alone, by catching them again and again in their sparkling net and by teasing them out of

<sup>49</sup> Cf. his *Lettre sur l'art du dessin dans les paysages*, 1795.

<sup>50</sup> This has been pointed out by Prosper Dorbec, *L'art du paysage en France*, Paris 1925, p. 44-48 — a book which, moreover, contains excellent remarks on the English painters.

About English water-colourists the reader will consult: H. M. Cundall, *History of British Water-Colour Painting*, 1928<sup>1</sup>, 1929<sup>2</sup>.



their natural forms keep up the eternal illusion of building and unbuilding. Was not that same illusion the delight of poets in those days?

### The Theory of the Picturesque

The new mode of seeing had in the meanwhile spread so far that a theorist could venture to impart it to a wider public. Such was the endeavour of William Gilpin in a series of books upon which he began to work in 1770 and which he concluded in 1798. He thought he could press the essence of his theory into a small number of critical moulds. His first and most comprehensive mould was the Picturesque, which he defined as what was "suitable for painting", what would "look well in a picture". He therefore recommended the practice of comparing real landscape with painted landscape. His Picturesque was a pleasing composition of integrating elements, anti-Euclidean and full of variety, of the "Rough", his second cliché. "A variety of parts" can only be obtained from rough objects. This "Rough" implies effect of light and shade, colouring, his third mould. Nature was rich in "rough elements", in picturesque components, but she frequently failed in composition. And now Gilpin proceeds to unveil the secrets of picturesque composition and to fix his mountain, lake and river rules: irregular breaks for the mountain line, irregular contours for the lake, asymmetric front-screens and side-screens for the river. And when we see him complete his grouping of details within the wider frame of the total scene, when we see him value the shaggy goat, the picturesque sheep and cow above the elegant horse, because the latter cannot be grouped with the same ease as the former, we grasp his picturesque as an all-embracing composition made up of smaller and ever smaller sub-compositions, all obedient to the charms of formal irregularity.

But why that queer label "rough" for his second formula? We can follow as long as the term is applied in its traditional sense. A mountain line may be rough. Rough — in opposition to the smooth and rectilinear features of the classic building — were the outlines of Gothic monuments, rough were the contours of ruins whether Gothic or classic. And if Gilpin could have looked at the rough patches standing for peaks and forests in Alexander Cozens' pictures he would have greeted him as an ally. But Gilpin's Rough is so many other things than what the term reasonably implies! When we find him giving the rough mountain line drawn by his young relative<sup>51</sup> as an illustration to the text the name of an "easy line", we begin to wonder why that obvious category — what we have called the "free and easy", — should have escaped him. But Gilpin had driven himself into a deadlock. He had started by an adverse criticism of Edmund Burke's Beautiful with its two characteristics, the Smooth and the Regular, which by way of contradiction would naturally lead him to the Rough and the Irregular, and he decided in favour of the former, the less felicitous term — where "irregular" and "easy" would have come nearer to what he meant, as is proved by his most frequent use of those two very words.

This is not all. Gilpin caused his system to break down, when, instead

<sup>51</sup> *Observations on Several Parts of England*, 1808, p. 90.

of making his Picturesque — the compositional sum total of so many structural "Roughs" — exclusively a matter for the eye, he allowed it all kinds of emotional accompaniments from the mildly sentimental to the shudderingly sublime. In this way the Picturesque from being a clear, compositional category was emotionalised into a critical blur. The Picturesque now harboured the sublime, for which there could not have been any room originally, and such a contradiction in terms as "picturesque grandeur" began to be current among contemporaries. "Picturesque" was now a hackneyed term interchangeable with "Romantic": picturesque or romantic grandeur; a picturesque or a romantic traveller.

Gilpin's finest observations lie outside his system. He had an eye for what attracted the sensitive water-colourists of his day: pleasing distances, under the effect of rain, and the blur.

Gilpin's "Rough" was soon forgotten, his Picturesque lived on as a critical unknown quantity. The discriminating hand trying to impose upon it useful delimitations against neighbouring categories interfered too late to stay the confusion. Uvedale Price,<sup>52</sup> with less material knowledge but more acumen than Gilpin, set up the Picturesque as a third category between Burke's Beautiful and Sublime. So the Baroque obtained a new lease of life by the side of classic regularity and that curious newcomer, the Picturesque, which was not smooth enough to be beautiful nor vast enough to be sublime. Price had a forerunner in the young Wordsworth who the year before, in his comment on his own description of a sunset, had protested that to call the Alps picturesque was insulting their sublimity.<sup>53</sup> Thus he explicitly stated that the Picturesque and the Sublime were mutually exclusive.

Later theorists could not improve upon Gilpin as an educator of the eye. Payn Knight, however, gave proof of a deeper insight into psychological backgrounds. He it was who called the Picturesque "a mode of seeing", and his verses on Claude's painting show how far the art of expressing pictures and landscapes verbally had advanced in the meanwhile.<sup>54</sup>

## Landscape Gardens and Picturesque Gardens

The days of Langley's grand manner were gone and the ha-ha had become a mere reminiscence.<sup>55</sup> But the Baroque ha-ha was the "leaping of the fence" followed by the discovery that nature was a garden and consequently each true garden a landscape. In this way the garden gates were thrown open wide for the Free and Easy. Once inside, it endeavoured to hold its ground between two tendencies, the pattern and the cult of the mood. So it was the same as with landscape-painting.

The pattern! Even a landscape garden might stiffen into formalism.

<sup>52</sup> *On the Picturesque as compared with the Beautiful* ... 1794.

<sup>53</sup> W.'s footnote to *Descriptive Sketches*, line 347.

<sup>54</sup> *The Landscape, a didactic poem*, 1794.

<sup>55</sup> In Miss Austen's *Mansfield Park* (1811), chap. 10, there is the "danger of slipping into a ha-ha". But that garden — Sotherton, having been built in the days of Elizabeth — is supposed to be old-fashioned. (In Florence Montgomery's *Misunderstood* [1870] a disobedient little boy narrowly escapes "tumbling over the ha-ha one day, and slipping into the pond the next." The place is "old Wareham Abbey, in the county of Sussex"; the time is not expressly stated, but may be assumed to have been the eighteen sixties. — Z.)



Take "Capability" Brown (1715-87), a bold innovator in garden-building. He might — as, for instance, in Harleyford — retain the flowing undulations of the lawn following the curve of the river, and by planting cedars place accents of natural grandeur across the scene. But the lay-out of a garden would soon become a matter of routine. Avenues gave way to clumps and belts, canals to serpentine, straight paths to winding walks, terrace parterres and labyrinths to tree-dotted lawns that carried their undulations up to the drawing-room windows. One pattern had made place for another pattern.

The mood! Langley had given the fashionable mood of the day as expressed in the Graveyard School of Poetry its appointed place within his own Baroque scheme. He it was who, consulting Claudian landscape pictures, had set up in his garden grounds artificial ruins in the "old Roman manner" to excite associations of a sweet, melancholy kind. The landscape school of gardeners continued the habit and, as soon as the Gothic mania took possession of the contemporary mind, replaced the Roman ruins by shattered walls in the Gothic style, which, in those days of emotional contemplation, seemed to come nearest to the expression of the natural.

In the meanwhile even the statues, so frequently used in the formal garden, had been forced into the service of the mood. Whereas in the classic garden they were supposed to accentuate a point in a design, their function was now to arouse an emotion proper to a given part of the garden landscape. The Dying Gladiator on the terrace above the garden portico in Rousham,<sup>56</sup> just where the visitor gets a commanding view of the river and the wide Oxford landscape, was fixed there to lend a note of pensiveness to a scene which Horace Walpole has called a piece of solitude to enjoy philosophic meditation.

The free and easy, the pattern and the mood had to arrive at a compromise, which was a long gradual process of which the *ferme ornée* was the most important landmark. Hagley Park (c. 1755) and The Leasowes (c. 1760) are famous examples in point. Both with their forest trees which, growing unfettered, came close to the house, and their grazing animals, which as a natural ornament entered into the general landscape conception, gave an impress of pleasing freedom. But artificialities intruded into this picture of natural ease. Hagley Park exhibited its ivy-covered Gothic sham ruin on one knoll and its neat Doric temple built by Athenian Stuart on another. The Leasowes, which on the whole were freer than Hagley Park, insisted on creating surprises for the visitor both in the dingle and by the side of its serpentine walks in the shape of seats, grottos, ruins and urns with plenty of classic inscriptions on them. Gilpin, after his visit to The Leasowes, remarked justly that all these things were improper decorations in an adorned farm, because they created not a sense of the natural but of the whimsical and amusing.<sup>57</sup> Had the eye of the builder been properly educated he would have arranged his "distances" to more advantage by causing them to be seen over a wood or sometimes through an opening in one.

The *ferme ornée* was rich in natural inessentials but it was wanting in those impressive landscape effects which the correcting hand of a "picturesquely"-minded artist might easily have managed. So there was

<sup>56</sup> Tipping, *English Gardens*, p. XLIV.

<sup>57</sup> *Observations on Several Parts of England*, 1808, I 59-62.

something wrong about the adorned farm. Such was the opinion of a critical onlooker in those days, who detected weak spots everywhere and suggested a way out, which, though in itself a fascinating experiment, was only a side-track that could not lead any further. That was Sir William Chambers.<sup>58</sup> If we consult his "dissertation" we get a view of the landscape garden of his day amusingly distorted by irony:

Our gardens differ very little from common fields, so closely is common nature copied in most of them ... A stranger is often at a loss to know whether he be walking in a meadow, or in a pleasure ground ... At his first view he is treated with the sight of a large green field, scattered over with a few straggling trees, and verged with a confused border of little shrubs and flowers ... From time to time he perceives a little seat or temple stuck up against the wall; he rejoices at the discovery, sits down, rests his wearied limbs, and then reels on again, cursing the line of beauty, till spent with fatigue, half roasted by the sun, for there is never any shade, and tired for want of entertainment, he resolves to see no more ... (l.c. V-VI).

Chambers concluded that both the formal and the landscape garden were wrong; one was absurd, the other vulgar. For him as for Gilpin variety was one of the strongest formative principles, and to demonstrate the possibility of its realization he placed before his contemporaries a lively picture of Chinese palaces and gardens, which showed a felicitous combination of nature's irregularities and the beauties of geometry, of natural freedom and technical triumphs defeating nature. He painted the endless raptures of variety in the Imperial Gardens near Peking with their four hundred pavilions, all different in architecture, their hundreds of lakes, cascades and shrubs and groves, and, on a strongly reduced scale, he realized this fairy world in Kew, of which he has left us his description, Kew with its woods coming right up to the palace, its lake and island, its menagerie and its pavilion, its wilderness with the Alhambra, the Pagoda and the Mosque behind it.

In the meanwhile Gilpin had discovered the Picturesque, and in the mind of a literary caricaturist, William Combe, the English countryside had become the sporting ground for the picturesque crank of the Dr. Syntax type, with a passion for prospects and Gothic ruins. This meant that the landscape garden was ripe for picturesque correction.

Of this we have documentary evidence in a book that came out in 1803.<sup>59</sup> The author, H. Repton, the greatest garden architect England ever had,<sup>60</sup> was for the landscape garden what Gilpin had been for landscape pure and simple. He was the great educator who by the display of a wealth of examples trained the eye of the public for the distinction between what was in good taste and what was in bad taste. For this purpose Repton placed before his readers pictures of landscapes, parks and gardens, with overlapping slides. Looking first at the picture with the slide clapped down the reader found a landscape or garden with some features in it likely to hurt a well-trained eye. Lifting the slide he found the blemish replaced by a picturesque alteration. By this simple device Repton illustrated point after point. He showed how light might affect the appearance of a scene along with the passing of the hours, morning or evening, natural things

<sup>58</sup> *A Dissertation on Oriental Gardening*, 1772, and *Plans ... of the Gardens and Buildings at Kew*, 1763.

<sup>59</sup> *Observations on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening...*, 1803.

<sup>60</sup> He is mentioned in *Mansfield Park* by Miss Austen as the ideal garden improver.



showing best with the sun behind them, artificial objects with the sun full upon them. Or he would by the same method familiarize the eye with the beauty of a good landscape line and he would demonstrate how by a few slight changes, the removal of a small number of trees or the widening of a river-bed, a scene might be improved upon. He was particular about the treatment of bridges, which according to him served to stress the idea of a river, and of prospects. If the outline of the wood formed a uniform boundary between the lawn and the horizon he recommended cutting an opening through the wood to relieve the harshness of the composition, so as to give the illusion of an extended lawn and to create distance and outlook.

Repton took architectural fashions as he found them. He had a smile for the Gothic pigstye with little pointed arches or battlements and the Gothic dairy which had displaced the hermitage, the grotto, or the Chinese pavilion. Yet in recommending for gardens the use of architectural stage properties he was impartial as to the choice of Classic or Gothic. He laid down the rule<sup>61</sup> that Gothic buildings contrasted best with roundheaded trees — not firs or poplars — and classic buildings with cone-shaped trees.

The same eclecticism, of an almost alarming kind, displays itself in a contemporary handbook<sup>62</sup> on parks and gardens. Charles Middleton, its author, was so obliging in meeting everybody's taste that he placed a series of alternative garden decorations at the disposal of the public, either "formal" or "picturesque", a classic or a Gothic dairy, a classic or a Gothic pavilion, a classic or a Gothic lodge, a classic or a Gothic bridge.

Nevertheless, the so-called Picturesque was now the dominating note among the forms struggling for expression in the gardens of those days. Whereas Painshill in Surrey with its Chinese and its classic bridge in wood is a picturesque garden of a mixed kind, Scotney Castle with its bridge across the moat and its castle ruins stands out as a glorious demonstration in earth, water and brick, in grass, flower and tree of the views of Gilpin and Uvedale Price.

*(To be concluded)*

Zürich.

BERNHARD FEHR.

## Notes and News

### Notes on *Coriolanus*

(The text is F, line-numbering as in Oxford 1 vol. ed.)

I. 1. 7. *Caius Martius*. *Martius* is the F spelling, and that of North's Plutarch translation. North begins, "The house of the Martians at Rome..." *Coriolanus* is the tragedy of a choleric humour. The spelling

<sup>61</sup> *An Enquiry into the Changes of Taste in Landscape Gardening*, 1806, p. 151.

<sup>62</sup> *Decorations for Parks and Gardens*, 1800.

usual in modern editions — *Marcus* — deprives the reader of the valuable associations with 'Mars', 'martial' etc., that are immediately suggested by *Martius*.

I. 1. 62. *they say poore Suters haue strong breaths, they shal know we haue strong arms too.* The play on *strong* and *breaths* has been noted. There appears to be a pun on *Suters*: 'suitors' and 'souters'. Of 'souter' OED says: "In the 16th and 17th cent. the word is freq. used with depreciatory force, esp. to denote a type of workman of little or no education." The breath of workmen is adversely commented in JC I. 2. 246. The breath of cobblers may have been extra bad, since sedentary work has ill effects on the digestion.

The OED 16th cent. forms 'soutter', 'sowtter', 'sowtar' and 'sowttar' imply a diphthong; but a diphthong pronunciation is not too far from *Suters* to make the pun impossible; and the 16th cent. spelling 'sutour' and the modern pronunciation indicate that the ME /u:/ was partly retained. The word was not purely Northern in Shakespeare's day (cf. OED).

I. 1. 116. *taintingly*. F2F3 *tantingly*. F4 *tauntingly*, now the more popular reading. Miss C. Porter (quoted in Furness) says: "The misprint in F2F3 seems to have suggested the 'tauntingly' of F4." *taintingly* is still more likely if it is remembered that *tantingly* is a possible spelling, not simply a misprint. OED does not give 'tant' for 'taint', but the variation *ai* and *a* occurs in some words for which we may presume the pron. /ɛ:/.<sup>1</sup>

I. 1. 122-5. *the Arme our Souldier,  
Our Steed the Legge, the Tongue our Trumpeter,  
With other Muniments, and petty helpes  
In this our Fabricke, if that they —*

*Fabricke* clearly means 'body' here, though the first OED example of this sense is 1695. The sense 'engine of war' (OED art. *Fabric* 2) seems also to be played on in this military context.

I. 1. 137-142. *... I receiue the generall Food at first  
Which you do live upon: and fit it is,  
Because I am the Store-house, and the Shop  
Of the whole Body. But, if you do remember,  
I send it through the Rivers of your blood  
Euen to the Court, the Heart, to th'seate o' th'Braine,*

The belly is speaking, representing the Patricians, the Senate; but the imagery corresponds to the 17th century. Roman citizens are London citizens. The belly is the merchant class, the heart (and /or/ the head, according to which interpretation of 1. 142 is taken) the surviving feudal centre of society. Menenius is expressing the Senate in terms of the 17th cent. English Parliament.

I. 1. 167-9. *But make you ready your stiffe bats and clubs,  
Rome, and her Rats, are at the point of battell,  
The one side must have baile.*

The jingle *bats ... battell*, though trifling, may well be noted as characteristic of Menenius' subtle frivolity. Mason suggested that Shakespeare used *baile* in the sense of 'bane', citing R and J II. 3. 8. 'Poison' would be a fitting sense of *baile* here, for Menenius would like the *Rats* to have bane.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Ekwall, *Hist. ne. Laut- und Formenlehre*, § 32.



- I. 1. 184-5. *A sickmans Appetite; who desires most that  
Which would encrease his euill.*

That euill has the special sense disease here, seems not to have been pointed out.

I. 1. 215. *They vented their Complaining*  
*vented* plays ironically on senses connected with 'wind' and 'belly'. Coriolanus implies that 'They said they were an hungry (l. 211), but they had all this in them to let out.' *complaining*s continues this irony by meaning 'grievances', but also 'com-plain-ings', i.e. what they were full of. 'Plain' in the sense 'full' was not rare in Shakespeare's time.

- I. 1. 225-227. *it will in time  
Win vpon power, and throw forth greater Theames  
For Insurrections arguing.*

Cf Lucrece 1716-1720:

*Here with a sigh as if her heart would breake,  
Shee throwes forth Tarquins name: he he, she saies,  
But more then he, her poore tong could not speake,  
Till after manie accents and delaies,  
Untimelie breathings, sicke and short assaies,  
Shee utters this, he he ...*

It is to be noted that Lucrece has difficulty in getting out what she has to say. Cf also A and C III. 7. 80-81:

*With news the time's with labour, and throwes forth  
Each minute some.*

Shakespeare did not distinguish between 'throw' and 'throe'. OED's first example of the spelling 'throe' is 1615. But it is plain that in the three passages just quoted modern 'throe' and 'throw' are both apposite.

I. 1. 228. *Go get you home you Fragments.*  
Modern editions put some stop after Go. This is wrong, for the idiom here is that in 'go sleep', 'go mend' etc. Schmidt (p. 481) gives 55 examples and says there are more. It is the equivalent of the modern 'Go and...'

- I. 1.231-2. *we shall ha meanes to vent*

*Our mustie superfluity.*

Here *vent* appears not to mean quite the same as in line 215. It has the general sense 'get rid of', but also seems coloured by the sense 'sell', which OED says was common between c1600 and c1670. It is the influence of *mustie* and *superfluity* that brings out this sense. The image is the ironical one of a trader joking about getting rid of his stale goods.

I. 1. After 232. *Enter Sicinius Velutus, Brutus ...*  
Partly because of the misprint *Annius* for 'Junius', modern editors have changed the order of entry, making the Senators enter first. But there is dramatic propriety in having the Tribunes enter first. Coriolanus has just mentioned them (ll. 222-223), he knows them, and their entry first gives the opportunity of a dramatic moment in which the Tribunes look malicious and Coriolanus contemptuous.

- I. 1. 234-5. *They haue a Leader,*

*Tullus Auffidius that will put you too't:*

*too't* is found in this phrase in Cor. II. 2. 160, M for M III. 2. 101, Alls II. 2. 50, III. 6. 1, Oth. II. 1. 119, III. 3. 471. There is one example of *to't* —

Wint. I. 2. 16. This should mean that the phrase was usually pronounced with stress on *too't* rather than on *put*.

I. 1, 261. *Bru. Mark'd you his lip and eyes.  
Sicin. Nay, but his taunts.*

Sicinius does not mean 'I did not, but I did mark his taunts'. He means 'I did not remark them so much as his taunts', i.e. 'What about his taunts?' Schmidt (p. 760) gives further examples of this use of *Nay but*.

I. 1. 265-267. *Such a Nature, tickled with good successe, disdaines the shadow which he treads on at noone...*

It is his own shadow that Coriolanus disdains. Symbolically, too, it is a copy of himself. It is smallest at noon, least in sight at noon, and can be trodden on at noon. Later it will be bigger, more in sight, and not trodden on. Thus Sicinius' remark forebodes in memorable image the main tragedy: that in some way Coriolanus ignores himself; that he knows what he will do in a military situation, but does not know how he will act in a psychological one. noon takes on the symbolic sense 'noon of fortune'.

I. 1. 276-282. *Sicin. Besides, if things go well,  
Opinion that so stickes on Martius, shall  
Of his demerits rob Cominius.  
Bru. Come: halfe all Cominius Honors are to Martius  
Though Martius earn'd them not: and all his faults  
To Martius shall be Honors, though indeed  
In ought he merit not.*

Come is classed by Schmidt as the 'rebuke' expression; but Brutus repeats Sicinius' idea in other words; so Come seems rather to mean 'Well, there we are then!' *In ought he merit not* is a strikingly weak way of saying 'in naught he merit'. The explanation is that, in Brutus' pedantically balanced style, the phrase answers *earn'd them not*.

I. 3. 1-19. (Volumnia talking to Virgilia.)

The following characteristics of this set-piece speech are notable:

1. Antithetical phrasing — *Sonne ... Husband ... absence wherein he wonne Honor ... embracements of his Bed, where he would shew most loue ... for a day of Kings entreaties, a Mother should not sel him an houre from her beholding ... let him seeke danger, where he was like to find fame ... I sent him ... he return'd ... at first hearing he was a Man-child ... in first seeing he had proued himselfe a man.*

2. This is backed up by alliteration — *absence ... Honor ... embracements ... Bed ... find fame ... browes bound ... Man-child ... man.*

3. Highly formal sentence construction — three sentences, two shorter ones on each side of a longer period — *When ...; when ...; when ...; I considering how ..., that ..., was pleas'd ...: To a cruell Warre I sent him ...*

4. A slight over-emphasis, occasioning artificiality, in the imagery — *plucked all gaze his way ... no better then Picture-like to hang by th' wall, if renowne made it not stirre ... I sprang ... in joy ...* (The same exaggerative emphasis is apparent in Volumnia's verse-speech in this scene: — 1. 34 *plucke Auffidius downe by th'haire*; 1. 46-7 *Hectors forhead, when it spit forth blood At Grecian sword, contemning.*)

The tone that results from these devices contrasts strongly with the colloquiality of the rest of the scene. Nor is it one we should expect for



a tête-à-tête. The first impression Volumnia makes is therefore unsympathetic — that of self-satisfied, affected and suppressedly vicious conventionality. That *Coriolanus* is a 'humorous' tragedy is best observed through these linguistic details.

I. 3. 23. *Then his good report should haue beene my Sonne, I therein would haue found issue.* The obvious sense of *issue* is 'progeny'. The sense 'outlet' may well be an ironical overtone, meaning that if her son had died, Volumnia would have found expression for herself in his fame, as she now did in his deeds.

I. 3. 44. *it more becomes a man Then gilt his Trophe.* Verity gives 'sepulchral monument' for *Trophe*. But cf OED Trophy sb. 1b. 'A painted or carved figure of such a (i.e. victory) memorial. 1634. The Trophies of his Ormus victory ... painted in Gold ...' So it seems likely that *Trophe* has its stricter sense here.

I. 3. 70. *hee did so set his teeth, and teare it.* The first OED example of emphatic 'do' is 1581; its first ex. from Shakespeare is: — 'Thou car'st for nothing ... I do care for something.' But in our ex. *did* so does not rebuff a negative, so we should rather expect the stress to be on *so*, not as in modern English on *did*.

I. 3. 84-6. *you confine your selfe most unreasonably ... you must go visit the good Lady that lies in.* This context may well imply that 'confine' was already used of childbirth, though the first OED ex. of this sense is 1774. Thus Virgilia confines herself unreasonably, but the good lady is reasonably confined.

I. 3. 94. *Penelope ... Uliesses ... Athica.* *Athica* appears to be the result of corruption of Ithaca by Attica, rather than a misprint. Transposition of *I* and *a* would not readily occur when one was a capital.

I. 4. 54. *Thou art left Martius.* The usual interpretation is 'thou art forsaken'. Schmidt suggests 'thou art Martius to the last'. But cf Hml V. 2. 237 — *What is't to leave betimes?* — where *leave* means 'die', a sense assigned it here by Schmidt himself (leave vb 11) and Kellner. (OED Leave vb I 8b gives the phrases 'leave life, breath', but not this absolute use.) Thus in our context we get *Thou art left* meaning 'You have gone and died'. We can now interpret the whole as 'You have gone and died Martius', or more probably 'You have died like yourself'.

I. 4. 62. *fetch him off.* OED fetch vb 16 has its first ex. of this 1648. But cf also All's Well III. 6. 19 (parallel indicated in Arden ed.).

I. 5. 4. *See heere these mouers, that do prize their hours  
At a crack'd Drachme: Cushions, Leaden Spoones ...  
... These base slaves ...  
... packe up ...*

The following have been suggested for *mouers*: agitators, clamourers for rights (referring to the riot in Rome), creatures, active fellows (ironically), shirkers. Would not a sense 'people moving things', i.e. an ironical word for their plundering activity, fit the context closer? Cf *packe up*.

I. 9. 36-40. *Martius. I thanke you Generall:  
But cannot make my heart consent to take  
A Bribe, to pay my Sword: I do refuse it,*

*And stand upon my common part with those  
That haue beheld the doing.*

The thrust of contempt in *beheld* reveals the irreconcilable pride beneath Martius' modest protestations. It is one of the touches contributing to our sense that Shakespeare is holding Martius at a distance from him, that *Coriolanus* is a tragedy with a hero of choleric humour.

I. 9. 41-46. *Mar. May these same Instruments, which you prophane,  
Neuer sound more: when Drums and Trumpets shall  
I'th'field proue flatterers, let Courts and Cities be  
Made all of false-fac'd soothing:  
When Steele growes soft, as the Parasites Silke,  
Let him be made an Overture for th' Warres:*

*Overture* is usually emended to 'coverture', which quite destroys the connection of ideas. The sense is: 'Drums and trumpets usually sound to battle (OED *Overture* 6), but you have made them sound to flatter me: complete your paradox by making the parasitic flatterer's soothing, instead of the flourish of drums and trumpets, the overture to battle.' If this implicit connection is made, emendation of *him* or *Overture* is unnecessary.

I. 9. 65, 67. *Marcus Caius Coriolanus.*

This is usually altered to 'Caius Marcius Coriolanus'. But cf. II. 1. 182-184:

*where he hath wonne  
With Fame, a Name to Martius Caius:  
These in honor followes Martius Caius Coriolanus.*

191-193: *My gentle Martius, worthy Caius,  
And by deed-atchieuing Honor newly nam'd,  
What is it (Coriolanus) must I call thee?*

and II. 2. 51: *Martius Caius Coriolanus.*

It is plain that the F order should be retained. The audience are familiar with the name Martius, not with Caius. The name they know already is therefore placed first.

I. 10. 22-3. *Embarquements all of Fury, shall lift up  
Their rotten Priuiledge, and Custome ...*

The mercantile word *Embarquements* elicits sense-play from *Priuiledge* and *Custome* — 'monopoly' and 'duty'.

II. 1. 60-65. *Meeting two such Weals men as you are (I cannot call you Licurgusses,) if the drinke you giue me, touch my Palat aduersly, I make a crooked face at it, I can say, your Worshippes haue deliuer'd the matter well ...*

We should expect the pronunciation /wɛ:l/ for 'weal' — cf OED *Well* sub 2 for confusion of 'weal' and 'well', ultimately the same anyway. Thus *Weales men* means politicians, but also 'wellsmen', i.e. people who keep saying 'well'. Cf 17: *Both. Well sir*; 30: *Both. Well, well sir, well*; 50: *Sicin. Menenius, you are knowne well enough too*. The 'well' is taken up by Menenius 60, 65, 71-73: *if you see this in the Map of my Microcosme, followes it that I am knowne well enough too? What harme can your beesome Conspectuities gleane out of this Charracter, if I be knowne well enough too*. Brutus repeats it: 74: *Come sir come, we know you well enough*; and 91: *you are well understood to bee ...* 'Wellsmen' also means people who draw the water — not wine — of their speech from a 'well' and



offer it to Menenius, who pulls a wry face at it. *Licurgusses* continues this line of word play — they are 'wellsmen', they do not 'gush' out real 'liquor'.

II. 1. 69-72. *if you see this in the Map of my Microcosme, ... What harme can your beesome Conspectuities gleane out of this Charracter ...* This would seem to be a reference to the 'character-writing' that became popular round about 1608 — the first printed book of prose 'characters', Hall's *Characters of Vertues and Vices*, appeared then. The balanced phrasing and imagery of the following are 'characteristic': 52-60. *I am knowne to be a humorous Patritian, and one that loues a cup of hot Wine, with not a drop of alaying Tiber in't: Said, to be something imperfect in fauouring the first complaint, hasty and Tinder-like vppon, to triuiall motion: One, that conuerses more with the Buttocke of the night, then with the forehead of the morning. What I think, I vtter, and spend my malice in my breath. And 66-69. And though I must be content to bear with those, that say you are reuerend graue men, yet they lye deadly, that tell you haue good faces ...* Having made a character of himself, Menenius goes on to make a character of Brutus and Sicinius: 77-89. *you are ambitious, for poore knaues cappes and legges: you weare out a good wholesome Forenoone, in hearing a cause between an Orendge wife, and a Forsetseller, and then reiourne the Controuersie of three-pence to a second day of Audience. When you are hearing a matter betweene party and party, if you chauce to bee pinch'd with the Collicke, you make faces like Mummings, set up the bloodie Flagge against all Patience, and in roaring for a chamber-pot, dismisse the Controuersie bleeding, the more intangled by your hearing: All the peace you make in their Cause, is calling both the parties Knaues.* Cf. also 96-100. These 'characteristic' passages are a possible corroboration of 1608 as the date for *Coriolanus*, but this cannot be pressed, since we already have Theophrastian sketches in Jonson's *Every Man Out* and *Cynthia's Revels*.

II. 1. 105-107. *more of your conuensation would infect my Braine, being the Heardsmen of the Beastly Plebeans.*

*Heardsmen* means 1. controllers of the 'herd', an image carried on in the literal sense of *Beastly*; and 2. men 'heard' by the *Beastly Plebeans*. Menenius implies: 'You infect the plebs with your talk. If you go on giving me your company you may infect me similarly.'

II. 1. 234-237.

*our veyl'd Dames*

*Commit the Warre of White and Damaske*

*In their nicely gawded Cheekes, toth' wanton spoyle*

*Of Phoebus burning Kisses:*

The controversy about *nicely gawded* — whether it means 'painted' or 'protected' — can be solved by reference to the context. *our veyl'd Dames* does not mean 'veiled on this occasion', but 'usually veiled'. The sense is, 'Our ladies, who are usually veiled, unveil carefully painted cheeks on this occasion.' They want Coriolanus to see them. It should be recollected that this speech is by Brutus, and ironical. He takes this chance of indicating that he does not rate the modesty of the Roman matron very high. The key words for the tone of the passage are *Commit*, *wanton spoyle*, and *burning Kisses*.

II. 1. 261-265. *Scicin. It shall be to him then, as our good will;  
a sure destruction.*

*Brutus. So it must fall out*

*To him, or our Authorities, for an end.*

*We must suggest the People, in what hatred*

*He still hath held them:*

It is usual to transfer the point after *end* to after *Authorities*. But the natural paraphrase of the F text is: The end must be destruction either for him or for our authority. If the passage had the sense some editors give it we should expect 'for our end' or 'for this end'.<sup>2</sup> And the customary alteration of F destroys the rhythmic balance, Brutus' line and a half against Sicinius' line and a half.

II. 2. 112-114.

*his Sword, Deaths stampe,*

*Where it did marke, it tooke from face to foot:*

*He was a thing of Blood, whose euery motion*

*Was tim'd with dying Cryes:*

This punctuation is usually changed to

*Where it did mark, it took; from face to foot*

*He was a thing of blood ...*

This change may be backed up by the following: I. 6. 21-22, *Whose yonder, That does appeare as he were Flead?*; 28-29, *I, if you come not in the blood of others, But mantled in your owne*; 68-69, *this painting Wherein you see me smear'd*; I. 8. 9-10, *'Tis not my blood, Wherein thou seest me maskt*; and Hamlet II. 2. 487-488, *head to foot Now is he total gules*.<sup>3</sup>

(To be continued)

Lund.

A. H. KING.

## Notes on Synchronic Grammar

### (i) Case in English

The question of case in modern English is renewed by L. Hjelmslev in the recently published first part of his *La Catégorie des Cas*<sup>1</sup> but the well-known objections of Jespersen<sup>2</sup> and others to the view of case by sentence-position, which Hjelmslev supports, are not disposed of. Moreover it would be possible to agree with the statement that "la catégorie des valeurs dites casuelles reçoit une expression linguistique dans les langues dites analytiques au même titre que dans les langues synthétiques" while doubting the justice of placing the "positional cases" of English on a level with the *s*-genitive, with Hjelmslev, who finds in the sentence *the boy sent*

<sup>2</sup> OED End sb 16 gives 'In short' for *for an end* here, changing the F punctuation as above. But it is better not to change if there is good sense already.

<sup>3</sup> I quote Craig's text here on account of textual corruption that does not affect the point at issue.

<sup>1</sup> *Acta Jutlandica VII*, Aarhus 1935, 118 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *The Philosophy of Grammar*, 174 ff.



*his mother a letter* a subjective, a dative, and a translativ; and continues: "A ces trois cas s'ajoutent dans le genre personnel le génitif en -s." But to class together thus within the scheme of a single language facts which in that language show no parallelism of formal expression is as fundamentally contrary to the principles of synchronic grammar as the failure to recognise resemblances of category between elements of different linguistic systems owing to superficial contrasts of form. Only the former error would permit the arbitrary schemes of Deutschbein and Sonnenschein; while the views of Jespersen seem rather based on inconsistent pursual of arguments he was in certain cases among the first to advance. In fact in asserting<sup>3</sup> that English could be attributed a dative "if we could find some truly grammatical criteria, either of form or of function, by which to tell the two cases apart," he leaves more scope than is either justifiable or necessary for the discovery of "cases" in "analytic" languages if, as would seem to be implied, a grammatical criterion is not essentially one of form. But his arguments principally concern matters of formal distinction: (i) it is impossible to recognise a positional dative, for in *I gave it him* we have the inverse order compared with *he gave Paul's son a book*. A few pages later<sup>4</sup> however we find him rejecting the transference of a case-terminology applicable to the oppositions *I-me*, etc. to the relations of nouns as "the argument is drawn from another word-class." The free order of the "dative" element is however equally confined to the pronouns, and it is far from apparent why the syntactical relations of the latter should be more relevant than the morphological to the classification of facts peculiar to the nouns. (ii) "Further, if in 'the man gave his son a book' *son* is in the positional dative, we must recognise a positional dative in all the following instances, in which it would be impossible to revert the order of the two substantives: '*I asked the boy a few questions* (etc.) — *I called the boy a scoundrel*.'<sup>5</sup>" The unexpressed assumption is presumably that this would be absurd. Yet if the formal type is identical, as Jespersen asserts, then there can be no objection to extending the title of dative to the corresponding noun-position here. To this there can be no semantic hindrance; those who on semantic grounds find in the accusatives of Indo-European languages an old directive beside a direct-object-case would still not desire to speak, for purposes of descriptive grammar, of different cases. We should be prepared to recognise an historical syncretism — though here of a syntactic nature — in the English "dative", at least if we follow the arguments of Jespersen to their logical conclusion.

There remain however certain doubts not raised by Jespersen, nor considered by Hjelmslev. If we analyse the first sentence-type (*he gave Paul's son a book*) so as to class *son* as dative, *book* as accusative or better translativ (Hjelmslev), the more serious difficulty will arise in classifying the word standing in second position (post-dative) in the other sentences which no argument so far adduced has proved of another category. For having identified the post-dative of the first sentence with the corresponding

<sup>3</sup> POG 174.

<sup>4</sup> POG 182.

<sup>5</sup> Jespersen's second argument is moreover partly negated by his first; for the analogy of the pronouns would show *I called the boy a scoundrel* (pronominal *him* it impatient of reversal) unparallel to the other sentences in grammatical structure.

element where the "dative" is lacking (it would seem obvious<sup>6</sup> at first sight that *letter* is the same case in *the boy sent (his mother) a letter* whether the dative be retained or otherwise) consistency would compel the same identification in *I asked the boy a few questions*, where *boy* may equally stand alone, and in *I called the boy a scoundrel*, a case of greater complexity. And if unable to fix the translative we shall obviously be in no better position with regard to the dative, which only finds formal expression through its situation relative to the former.<sup>7</sup>

This difficulty could be avoided by referring to the word-order of the single post-verbal<sup>8</sup> complement as non-subjective, making the distinction of dative and translative only in the case of two (functionally fixed) complements. This would have certain advantages: (i) Other noun-positions corresponding to pronominal positions requiring forms of the *me-him* series, such as the place after prepositions which Hjelmslev without adequate reason classes as "translatif", could consistently be defined as non-subjective. (ii) Such passive constructions<sup>9</sup> as *he was sent a letter; he was called a scoundrel*, of which according to Hjelmslev's terminology we should have to regard the first elements as "converted datives" would no longer stand in arbitrary contrast to the "converted translative" of *he was sent*.

The objections to such an alternative are however serious. If the principal fault of the earlier systems of Deutschbein and Sonnenschein was their completely aprioristic nature — it would be impossible to conceive a language which did not possess, in their sense, a scheme of cases — the same may be urged in lesser measure here; for wherever it is possible to establish a functional order of nouns, there we could with the premisses of Hjelmslev be certain to find case. And what value the test of functional word-order may possess is more than offset for modern English by other considerations. It is easy to conceive, and we must be prepared to find, a language in which the treatment of nominal word-orders as cases would not give rise to the particular objections which in the case of English

<sup>6</sup> But may however easily be doubted; for in the type with retained dative only the latter can be converted to the subject of a passive without otherwise altering the sentence-construction. The fact that it is impossible to say e.g. *they summoned and gave him the letter* (but only e.g. *they copied and gave him the letter*) is not relevant; the former sentence is only ungrammatical for the same reason as the type *Getreide- und Einfuhrzölle für Vieh*; in the former sentence too "die beiden Summanden in der Klammer sind in ihrer Struktur verschieden" (Debrunner IF. L, 184), but the possibilities of word-group division, in speech, can here counteract more easily the "ungrammatical" effect of the phrasing.

<sup>7</sup> Which fact (rather than the explanation of Jespersen (MEG III 14.12) accounts for the impossibility of *they offered the man*, etc.

<sup>8</sup> The position in direct statement is here taken as typical. The systematic variations in other clause-types may be regarded as part of the claim of the system of word-order in English to morpheme-status. For only where, to use the terminology of Hjelmslev, the *morphème* is not covered by a single *formant* is its status as such assured. If we went so far as to take this as criterion H.'s *sémantème* and *formatif* would naturally coincide.

<sup>9</sup> The fact that only the (pro-)noun in dative position can be made subject of such sentences without additional alteration of their structure (by use of preposition, etc.) might argue that it is more particularly the dative which is regarded as identical with the isolated non-subjective; to which the shift of verbal meaning (or relation of verb to complement) entailed by the addition of a second post-verbal (or in passive phrases by the existence of a post-verbal) would be no objection, for such a shift is common to such instances as *they presented the guest (with a gift)* where the case of *guest* could not be held altered by the prepositional phrase.



have presented themselves; we have no reason to believe that these objections are due rather to the nature of word-order in general than to the non-casual character of English word-order. Even if the designations of dative position, etc. be retained it would be singularly superfluous to refer to them as cases, English possessing no other specifically nominal positions of a functional nature which as non-casual would stand in opposition to the former. For the term *case* would scarcely have been found appropriate to a fully inflected language which possessed no other category of nominal inflection (e.g. number, gender, etc.). Case is not, in the languages in which this term is fixed, the equivalent of nominal ending-morpheme, as in English it would become the equivalent of nominal position-morpheme — that is in so far as the s-genitive, which has gained a large measure of independence and is clearly on another footing, is left out of count.

Further certain peculiarities which English shares with other (notably modern Scandinavian) languages are obscured by the establishment of a substantival case-scheme. The classification together of predicative and object-complement, the grammatical identification of the final member of *he is a fool* with that in *he knows a fool* (or of those in *he called him a fool*; *he sent him a fool*) under the translative case, which the identification of these types in respect of noun (and virtually of pronoun) would demand, scarcely corresponds with the linguistic sentiment for which the adjective-permitting<sup>10</sup> character of the final position of the former syntagmata is significant. English presents very much less of a closed system than schematisation of the kinds considered would suggest. And though the absence of semantic correspondence of English "cases" with inflected types is in itself no insuperable bar to their identification in type, it must be asked how far by use of "empty" grammatical devices such as the passive and the prepositions have in English largely become, the order of nouns does not replace or continue the freer orders of earlier periods, i.e. is not rather of psychological than grammatical nature,<sup>11</sup> like the fixed German order discussed by T. Kalepky ZRP XXXVII, 361.

Oxford.

C. E. BAZELE.

---

<sup>10</sup> The possibility of the use of an adjective in a given noun-position is the sole properly linguistic criterion of a predicative as opposed to an object, and where Jespersen's classification is at variance one is at pains to note the principle of selection.

In Danish (and Riksmål) the identity of grammatical type is further stressed by the rules of order for adverb, etc.: "For hovedobjektet gjelder samme regel som for predikativet" (A. Western, *Norsk Riksmåls-Grammatik* 220, who however still deals with object and predicate in different sections of *Den formelle (!) Del*.)

When Franz regards *he is no longer the strong man he was ten years ago* as an instance of the rare "auslassung des nominativrelativs" (*Shakespeare-Grammatik*<sup>3</sup>, p. 310) he certainly goes contrary to the modern English system; the "omitted" pronoun is rather to be regarded as equivalent to an object-pronoun (i.e. Hjelmslev's "translative") than as "nominative."

<sup>11</sup> For the nominal word-order of the English sentence can only be regarded as fixed where the choice of other devices — diathesis, etc. — is considered free. Actually the reverse is usually true, the choice e.g. of active or passive constructions following upon and being fixed by the — in itself free — order of nouns. In fact it is rather this purely mechanical use of the voices, and to some extent of the prepositions, which replaces, and in its arbitrary and formal nature resembles, the earlier systems of case.

## Reviews

*Zur Vorgeschichte des "Beowulf."* By WALTER A. BERENDSOHN. 302 pp. Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard. 1935. Dan. Kr. 15.

The author of this interesting study is a well-known Germanist, who for 20 years (as he tells us in his preface) carried about with him the plan of the work before making it ready for the printer. We have before us, therefore, the fruit of a long period of labor and meditation. Berendsohn proceeds on the assumption that the author of *Beowulf* (whom he calls the Angle) had sources the text of which he drew upon freely; our problem, then, is to find a method of disentangling the passages so incorporated from the passages composed by the Angle himself. Berendsohn begins with an analysis of the matter and the style of those passages which may most safely be attributed to the Angle: the religious passages. This analysis leads him ever further, until, by comparisons and contrasts, he has worked out to his satisfaction the marks of differentiation which he needs. Thus, he concludes that the Angle is subjective, whereas his heathen or secular sources are objective in representing *gemütsbewegungen*. He therefore attributes to the Angle such passages about Grendel as

712 mynte se manscaða      manna cynnes  
sumne besyrwan      in sele þam hean,

but to the Angle's sources such passages as

726 eode yrremod;      him of eagum stod  
ligge gelicost      leoht unfæger.

Everyone would agree, of course, that the *Beowulf* poet had sources, though few would insist, as does Berendsohn (p. 80), that these sources were written. Unluckily they have not come down to us, and we cannot be sure of their wording, in spite of Berendsohn's valiant attempt to isolate bits of them here and there. It is surely a fallacy to maintain that an author must always write in the same style. Let me illustrate with two passages from the *Ambassadors* of Henry James, one from the second, the other from the fourth book:

Strether called, his second morning in Paris, on the bankers of the Rue Scribe to whom his letter of credit was addressed, and he made this visit attended by Waymarsh, in whose company he had crossed from London two days before. They had hastened to the Rue Scribe on the morrow of their arrival, but Strether had not then found the letters the hope of which prompted this errand.

Chad raised his face to the lamp, and it was one of the moments at which he had, in his extraordinary way, most his air of designedly showing himself. It was as if at these instants he just presented himself, his identity so rounded off, his palpable presence and his massive young manhood, as such a link in the chain as might practically amount to a kind of demonstration.

The passages are perhaps equally characteristic of the author, but they differ markedly in style. In like manner, I cannot see it as inherently improbable that the two Grendel passages quoted above were written by the same poet; certainly they have come down to us in the same poem.



I would agree with Berendsohn that gnomic bits like *Gæð a wyrd swa hio scel* (455b) were not composed by the *Beowulf* poet, but it need not follow that he got them from his sources, unless indeed one includes among these an English counterpart of the *Hávamál*. If we take the poet to have been fond of proverbial wisdom (a presumption reasonable enough), we have a sufficient explanation of the gnomic passages.

I will add a few notes (out of many) on matters of detail. When the poet dwells on old age (p. 26) he exemplifies a Germanic trait, if we may believe J. Bühler, *Kultur des Mittelalters* (1931), p. 84. I cannot agree that Hrothgar's so-called sermon is "sehr ungeschickt eingefügt" (p. 26); the technique is not realistic here (or anywhere else in the poem), but a warning against the dangers involved in success and prosperity comes most appropriately at this point in the narrative, if we are to have didactic passages at all. To call lines 175 ff. a strange mixture (p. 27) is to judge them by modern, not by medieval standards. The sword found in Grendel's cave cannot be looked upon as a strictly Old-Germanic product (p. 28), and the juxtaposition on it of two traditions of ornamentation (as on the Franks Casket) need not disturb us any more than it disturbed our forefathers. Modern again is Berendsohn's criticism of the welcoming speech of Hrothgar to Beowulf (p. 53); the information about Ecgtheow in this speech is for the reader, of course, not for Beowulf (Shakespeare uses a like technique). Lines 1330-40 are not properly described as "sinnloses Gerede" (p. 55). The contrast in lines 901-15 is one between Heremod and Beowulf, not between Heremod and Sigemund (p. 56). Berendsohn's speculations about Heorowearð (pp. 77, 250) want plausibility. His critical estimate of the *Beowulf* poet (pp. 78 ff.) suffers, in part at least, from a failure to understand the poet's art. I do not believe that the poet represents Beowulf as swimming from the Low Countries to Gautland with 30 suits of armor; see *E. S.* XV 151. The name *Wealththeow* belongs to the original Scandinavian version of the Scylding story, in my opinion; see *Klaeber Studies in English Philology* (1929), pp. 156 f. The Wylfings probably lived in Mecklenburg or Hither Pomerania, not in East Gautland (p. 236); see the article "Wulfingas" in my edition of *Widsith* (1936), pp. 199 f. The *apum*- of line 84 has nothing to do with oaths (p. 237). It is hardly right to say that the Dane killed by the avenger of Withergyld is called "*þegn der Königin*" (p. 246); he is actually referred to as *se fæmnanþegn*, whatever that means; the meaning given by Berendsohn can be had only by emending to *þære fæmnan þegn*, and, even so, *fæmne* would hardly mean 'queen.' Berendsohn's identification of the victim with Hrothmund, none too plausible in any case, cannot be reconciled with the fact that the action of the episode took place at the Danish court. The failure of the names *Ingeld* and *Froda* to alliterate is no argument against the genuineness of either name (pp. 247 f.); presumably the Heathobards made as little use of alliterative name-giving as did their kinsmen the Langobards. On the other hand, the want of the characteristic *h*-alliteration of the Scylding family in the name *Freawaru* indicates that this name is not original; the lady's true name, *Hrut*, happens to be preserved in Scandinavian tradition. I do not believe that *Scyld* is to be derived from *Scyldingas* (p. 249). I pass over the baseless theory (p. 252; cf. pp. 25 f.) that Hrothgar murdered his two brothers and married Halga's widow, thus turning Hrothulf into another Hamlet.

The volume swarms with misprints. It concludes with an "Anhang: Zum Widsip" (pp. 284-95), a slightly revised version of the author's *Widsith* paper of 1915. The paper must be reckoned unsuccessful. The *Beowulf* study now before us, however, was well worth doing, I think, even though I cannot agree with the author's conclusions. All students of the poem will profit by a careful reading of this stimulating and provocative volume.

Baltimore, U.S.A.

KEMP MALONE.

---

*The Chronicle of Melrose, from the Cottonian manuscript Faustina B. IX in the British Museum.* A complete and full-size facsimile in collotype, with an introduction by ALAN ORR ANDERSON and MARJORIE OGILVIE ANDERSON and an index by WILLIAM CROFT DICKINSON. London: Percy Lund Humphries and Co. 1936. fol. (Studies in economics and political science, No. 100).

Although a historical publication like this falls outside the scope of this journal, we make an exception for this important and beautifully produced volume, even though a short notice will have to suffice. This is the most important Scottish monastic chronicle, the original of which, kept up for more than a century in the abbey of Melrose, is now in the British Museum. After the seventeenth-century edition of Fulman, an edition was prepared for the Bannatyne Club in 1835 by Joseph Stevenson, from whose hand a translation appeared in 1856. According to the introduction to the present facsimile edition, this translation is not very satisfactory and the two editions are very inaccurate. Seeing that the various sections of the chronicle were written by all sorts of scribes at very different periods — from the middle of the twelfth to the third quarter of the thirteenth century — a reproduction of the MS. was highly desirable. For it is only on the basis of this that a future editor will be able to determine the value of every passage — towards which not only internal evidence but the handwriting also will be a valuable aid.

Apart from this purpose, however, the facsimile also affords a very striking illustration of the way in which such a monastic chronicle, to which several generations contributed, came into existence. The events of the various years were entered by many hands, apparently from cursory notes which after the definitive working-up were destroyed; throughout we find corrections in the text, introduced either by the writers themselves or by later revisers, very often also on the authority of information from travellers. It is not surprising, therefore, that the "Synopsis of the hands" takes up a large portion of the introduction. Further, the great variety of hands makes this chronicle very important palæographically, so that the reproduction is also a valuable contribution to the study of the Scottish schools of penmanship.

It seems to us that for all these purposes one could hardly wish for a better edition. The introduction, which keeps strictly to the text and does



not concern itself with historical questions, gives evidence of a thorough study of the MS. An index of places and names and of some important topics filling over a hundred pages is so full that it can almost be regarded as a summary of contents. And, to mention last the most important point, the reproduction of the MS. is so excellent that, in spite of some inevitable indistinctnesses, for which the original will have to be consulted, we are fully prepared to believe that various marginal additions are more legible in the facsimile than in the original. Altogether a very fine book, as well for its get-up as for its scholarly character.

The Hague.

L. BRUMMEL.

*The Seege of Troye. A Study in the Intertextual Relations of the Middle English Romance the "Seege or Batayle of Troye".*  
By G. HOFSTRAND. (Lund Studies in English. IV.) 205 + XV  
pp. Lund: Gleerup. 1936.

The textual history of the 14th century romance "The Seege of Troye" was first investigated as long ago as in 1883, in a Göttingen dissertation by Zietsch. At that date only two manuscripts were known — MS Harley 525 ("H") and MS Lincoln's Inn 150 ("L"). The two versions contained in these two manuscripts differ considerably from each other, e.g., in the matter of rhymes, and it is obvious at a glance that the one manuscript cannot be a copy of the other. Zietsch assumes that they go back to a common original and that one of the scribes must have made a number of alterations and additions of his own. Since the original is lost, it is not immediately clear which manuscript it is that is due to this enterprising scribe. Zietsch suggests that it is probably L, on the ground that the version of *Piers Plowman* also contained in this manuscript (which is in one hand throughout) is much corrupted. MS H is thus regarded by him as the "best" manuscript, i.e. as closest to the original. This suggestion, which of course is based on very slight evidence, appears to have been generally accepted as an established fact by German philologists; thus, without further discussion, by Fick, the next writer on the subject, in a Breslau dissertation of 1893, and still by Hibler in a monograph published as an introduction to his edition of the poem (1928). By the time Fick published his study a third manuscript had come to light, MS Egerton 2862 ("E"); this is grouped by him together with L, on account of certain similarities between these two versions, but since for various reasons neither appeared to be a copy of the other Fick concluded that they both go back to a common original, which he terms Y. He constructs a "table of descent" according to which we have an original, X, from which are descended on the one hand MS H, the "best" manuscript, and on the other the more or less corrupt Y, of which L and E are copies. Against this we have an American school of thought inaugurated by Wager, with a study published in 1899: he argues that L is likely to be closest to the original rather than H, since L follows what we believe to have been the sources of the poem

closer than this latter manuscript. Miss Barnicle, in the Introduction to her edition of "The Seege", published by the EETS in 1928, is also of the opinion that L is the manuscript which has best preserved the original romance, this on account of the clarity and general quality of the L text. She agrees with Fick, however, in dividing the manuscripts into two groups — MS H on the one hand, and MSS L and E on the other, to which latter group is now added a new manuscript, MS Arundel XXII ("A"), printed for the first time in the EETS edition; but she is of the opinion that both H and LEA are copied direct from the original X without any intervening copy Y as the immediate source of LEA.

A great variety of opinion exists also with regard to the question of the dialects of the four versions and of the original romance. MS H, for instance, is localised by Hibler to "Gloucester- oder Worcestershire", by Barnicle to the Fen country, while Wager, with Zietsch and Fick, regard it simply as "Southern". The original romance, "die Ur-Seege", is placed by Zietsch "in einer Gegend des Suedens", by Hibler in central or north Warwickshire, and by Barnicle in the north-west Midlands.

It is evident, then, that a renewed and a thorough investigation of the various problems connected with "The Seege of Troye" was called for. The study recently published by Dr. Hofstrand, the title of which appears above, ably fulfils this want. The author makes a detailed and extremely careful analysis of the four versions comparing them line by line and word by word. First are examined the passages where L differs from EAH in sense or in rhyme, by exchange of synonyms, by addition or omission of a word, a line, or a whole passage; then the instances in which AH together differ from LE are scrutinized in the same manner, and finally also the lines in which L and H show more or less similarity. The peculiarities which characterize each manuscript are also considered in detail. In this way the author tries to ascertain, as far as possible, what is original beneath the layers of later alterations, modifications, and additions, and to reach an appreciation of the four versions based not on general impressions but on actual evidence. The results reached by these thorough and painstaking methods stand out conspicuously against those of earlier writers on the subject. Dr. Hofstrand comes, like them, to the conclusion that the manuscripts fall into two separate groups belonging to two distinct lines of transmission, but he places on the one hand MS L, which is shown to contain the version closest to the original and thus to be the "best" manuscript, and on the other MSS E, A, H. Of this latter group E is closest to L, while A and H form a separate branch of this line, "once removed" from their common original (cf. "Table of descent" p. 158). The two lines of transmission go back to a common original, Y; but Y is not regarded as the ultimate original but as a copy of the original, which is termed X in the "Table of descent". The characterization of the manuscripts contains many interesting observations. Of particular interest is H, which has been remodelled by a scribe with a distinct taste of his own, a "rehandler" who tried to smarten up the sometimes rather homely style of his original by cutting out or glossing over various minstrel traits and by enlivening and speeding up the tale generally. With regard to the dialect, the original is localized, on the evidence of the rhymes, to "the less Scandinavianized parts of the district just south of the Wash and the Lincs border" (p. 188). Finally should be noted also the chapter on



"Literary Influences" in which the author draws attention to the close connection between "The Seege of Troye" and certain other ME romances ("Sir Beves of Hamtoun", "Arthour and Merlin", etc.).

The evidence on which these results are based is carefully sifted and weighed. The author has an intimate knowledge of the whole literature of Middle English romances which has sharpened his ear: every scrap of evidence seems to have been noted and utilized, and at the same time a sane and well-balanced judgement makes him careful not to press his evidence too far. His argumentation is careful and convincing, and he is able to prove his point satisfactorily in almost every case. The results are thus on the whole acceptable, and the question of the intertextual relations of the four versions of "The Seege" seems definitively solved by this thoroughly scholarly investigation. The one point of any importance on which the present writer feels inclined to doubt its conclusions is with regard to the supposed existence of X, the "Ur-Seege", i.e. the original behind Y. The reasons brought forward in support of this theory seem too vague to carry much weight. The instances of metrical crudities quoted, for example, need not be due to corruption of a smooth and well-polished original but may just as well be original blemishes which have been retained in all four versions; this applies also to the two cases of repetition cited (LEA II. 85-6, 195-208), which are not so striking as to indicate necessarily confusion in the course of transmission, i.e. in Y.

A point of great importance to consider in all questions of intertextual relationship is the question of the manner of transmission, whether by word of mouth or by written copies. This is a point which has been left altogether out of consideration by previous writers concerned with the textual history of "The Seege of Troye". Fick, in his "table of descent", reckons only with written copies and Hibler is wholly engrossed with the idea of the "Schreiberpersönlichkeiten" which to his mind account for all differences between the four versions. Miss Barnicle, it is true, is clear that our romance was composed by a minstrel and intended to be sung or recited, not read; she regards MSS L and E as "minstrel books" as against A and H which are considered as "closet copies". But in her argument on the textual relations of the versions she, like Fick and Hibler, regards MSS L, E, A, and H as direct copies of a lost MS Y = the original; that is to say she regards the four versions as homogeneous entities, each being the reflection of the original in *one* mind. Manuscript and version thus become wholly identical, and the possibility of influence from a spoken tradition or intermediate manuscript copies, is never considered.

On this point Dr. Hofstrand is in advance of previous writers on "The Seege" and many other writers concerned with the textual history of this branch of Middle English literature. He has evidently given much thought to the question of the manner of transmission of this, and other, Middle English romances, and all through his analysis and argument he keeps in mind the possible influence of oral transmission and also the possible existence of traces of earlier manuscript copies. He thus takes a less mechanical and considerably wider view of his subject than his predecessors in the field — it is the history of the versions he is concerned with, and the extant manuscripts are regarded simply as the ending-points of different lines of transmission in which orally preserved versions as well as intervening

written copies all take their places. Examined in this light the entities dissolve into complexes: MSS E and A appear to be partly dependent on oral tradition, being probably copied from originals taken down from memory or from oral recital (cf. pp. 118, 147, 150, 152), MS H on the other hand seems to be descended from a line of written originals (p. 118, cf. p. 103) though at some points the influence from version E, i.e. from spoken tradition, is to be noticed (p. 149). All three manuscripts also show traces of the existence of one, or more, intervening copies (pp. 134f., 138, 150, 158). It is only in the case of L that no traces (or practically none — cf. p. 62) are found of influence from transmission or of the work of earlier copyists: it is the manuscript which is closest to the original, and must evidently (though the author does not expressly state this) be regarded as a more or less direct copy of Y.

It is only to be regretted that the author does not take the reader into his confidence from the beginning — a discussion of the whole question of the manner of transmission of Middle English minstrel romances and of "The Seege of Troye" in particular, given, e.g., in the Introduction (which now is very scanty), would have been a great help to the reader in following from the outset the trend of the author's argumentation. As it is, we are left to realize bit by bit from vague hints given *en passant* (references to mishearings etc.) that his point of view differs considerably from that of previous writers: it is not until p. 118 that we get a definite statement of his opinions in this respect. Nor do we get a summary or a survey of all the results reached as to indications of influence from oral transmission or traces of intermediate copies, as we might expect to do, e.g., in the chapter on "Conclusions and Stemma". We do get in that chapter what appears to be the tail-end of such a discussion (pp. 158-9), but the body of the argument has dropped out and as it stands the paragraph is disconnected and out of context. It only serves to give the reader a taste of how interesting a general discussion of the author's views and conclusions regarding this subject might have been. Now it is mostly only in the course of the analysis that the various pieces of evidence for oral, resp. written, transmission are referred to and the conclusions to be drawn from them stated or indicated. We thus have to look for them in many scattered places (cf. refs. to pages given above). This makes the book more difficult to utilize to the full than need have been the case. Even the reader who studies the book carefully, often has a certain difficulty to get a clear idea of the manner of transmission in each case and to keep together all that can be deduced in that respect. And the cursory reader who turns, perhaps, to this work from Hibler's or Barnicle's and does not read the whole discussion through but turns for the results to the "Table of descent" given on p. 158, may not realize that this table is an abstraction, a mere skeleton that does not indicate all traceable stages in the transmission, whether written copies or oral versions<sup>1</sup>, but gives merely the *lines* of descent, the

<sup>1</sup> Not even the "parent copy" of MSS E, A, H (referred to pp. 51, 52, 67-8, 70 etc.), which plays an important part in the argument, is indicated, nor the common "parent copy" of A and H referred to p. 103. Since H represents a line of written transmission, this latter copy must be kept distinct from the manuscript taken down from memory or from oral recital from which A was copied (pp. 150, 152). On the other hand both X and its copy Y are marked in the table. The fact that no other intervening copies are taken into account is of less importance, and is in any case expressly remarked (p. 158).



lines along which the transmission can be traced. Thus this is not a "table of descent" in the sense of previous writers and not directly comparable with that of Fick and Parnicle which are meant to show all traceable links in the chain. The author may have felt a certain hesitation to press his results too far or to define or outline them too clearly by a summing up, but even though the conclusions must necessarily often be vague or tentative, even though it is sometimes more a case of indications than of downright evidence on which unassailable deductions can be built, a collective discussion would have been instructive and valuable.

Finally one or two details may be touched upon. In trying to ascertain which lines in the present romance are original and which are not, the author argues out on its merits each individual instance of difference between the four versions "always accrediting the original poem with the best sense" (Introd. p. XI). This seems an acceptable premise and the discussion of the various cases contains many pieces of shrewd reasoning and many interesting observations. The conclusion reached, viz. that L is the manuscript which has best preserved the original, is well supported and appears correct. But when in the course of his argumentation the author is inclined occasionally to press the matter further than implied by the above principle and to assume that the unknown original of "The Seege" also had necessarily and in every instance the best metrical *form*, he seems to be on more uncertain ground. The assumption that what is best from the metrical point of view is also necessarily closest to the original appears to me to be a point open to discussion. The romance does not otherwise give the impression of being the work of a skilled poet or versifier; Dr. Hofstrand himself points out (p. 117) that "the poem is more a sort of honest old chronicle than anything else" and it is not to be considered as "a truly artistic piece of work". But in spite of this opinion we frequently meet cases where a line is deemed to be original solely because it is the best from a metrical point of view. Typical instances are the comments on lines 107, 414, and 1386, which in the summing up on p. 91 are included among the lines retained in MSS A and H but lost in L and E; when we turn to the detailed examination of the AH lines we find (pp. 77, 85) that they are considered to be original simply because the LE lines are metrically heavier or because "the AH line ... seems better". Arguments of this kind are frequent (cf., e.g., p. 5, l. 201, with the comment "L has metrically the better line. L—EA", with a line above EA to indicate common derivation from a corrupt copy; or p. 39, l. 1940, "The L form is metrically the better. L—EAH", etc. etc. — cf. also list p. 50). The number of metrically good lines in L, the manuscript which for other reasons must be considered closest to the original, slightly outnumber those in the other manuscripts, it is true, but no safe inference can be drawn from this fact, since the other versions also contain good readings not found in L. MS L may have passed through the hands of a minstrel who knew his craft better than most, and the good lines in the AH versions need not necessarily be original readings retained in AH but lost in LE. That is as may be. But it might equally well be argued that a poem which is handled by "disours", by professional verse-reciters and versifiers, who on account of their trade must have possessed a fairly good metrical ear so as to remember and carry in their heads a more or less wide repertoire of verse, is not very likely to have its metrical form spoilt and chipped. Rather, if

its form was somewhat knobblly from the beginning it might become smoothed from long handling by experienced craftsmen, while a poem handed down by means of written copies, done by scribes who, perhaps, never read the lines out aloud but merely took them in by the eye, might more easily be spoilt metrically. It must always be a precarious business to draw any inferences as to the original *metrical form* of a poem which is largely handed down orally — at any rate it is impossible to be sure that in a romance whose author appears to have been no very great artist, a line is original because it is good metrically. The sense and the rhymes, similes and other outstanding expressions and phrases was probably what a minstrel's memory concentrated on: the small words and the padding, which largely account for the metre of a line, he might easily supply himself, if his memory failed.

The author has examined for himself the four extant manuscripts of "The Seege" and gives a description of them in the Introduction. I had hoped to find in this connection information on a point which may prove to be of a certain interest. Both Miss Barnicle and Hibler mention the fact that MS E contains among other scribblings in the margin, the following, "Thomas Waker (or Maker?) of lytel belinges" (fol. 73 b) and, again, "By me Thomas" (fol. 127a) enclosed in a scroll, and below the scroll "waker" (or maker) (cf. Barnicle, *Introd.* p. XVI; Hibler: "Zuerst scheinbar als Versuch "By me Thomas" und danach eingerahmt"). "lytel belinges" is identified by Barnicle as Little Bealings, Suffolk, but neither she nor Hibler says anything about the date of the handwriting, whether contemporary with the manuscript or of a later date. It would have been of interest if Dr. Hofstrand in his re-examination of the manuscripts had thought to ascertain this — especially if the former alternative should prove to be the case — and also if he had given us an opinion as to whether we should read "Waker" or "Maker". His aim in re-examining the manuscripts was chiefly to give a list of collations — these are, however, not so complete as might be wished; they also contain not infrequent misprints. A List of Corrigenda, published separately afterwards, aims, however, at making good the more important of the omissions and mistakes.

Lund.

ASTA KIHLBOM.

---

*Literary Relations of England and Scandinavia in the Seventeenth Century.* By ETHEL SEATON. (Oxford Studies in Modern Languages and Literature.) xvi + 384 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1935. 15s. net.

The preface tells us that this extensive investigation into Anglo-Scandinavian connections originated in a study of Sir Thomas Browne's Icelandic correspondence. The book "grew out of a casual wonder that, although England still knows the letters written to Sir Thomas Browne by his Icelandic friend Theodorus Jonas, Iceland, usually the careful conservator of learning, should have lost sight of the letters of Browne himself". Miss Seaton did not find these letters. Instead she set about

reconstructing the cultural background implied by Browne's curiosity about Iceland. The result is a work of just on 400 pages, its aim being to show how, during the 17th century, Scandinavians turned toward England, and English people learnt with growing interest about goings-on in Scandinavia. Miss Seaton has plainly made use of every possibility the material offered, and has carefully listed and placed the hundreds of references the documents afforded. Accompanied by a mass of scholarly citation, excerpts of all sorts — travels, diplomatic reports, minutes of learned societies, private correspondence, topographical descriptions, scientific curiosities, mythological gropings, passages from Saxo and the Brothers Magnus, popular superstitions and notions, and political allusions — all mingle for the eye, and are illustrated by 16 beautiful full-page plates representing Gustavus Adolphus, Lapland drums, Robert Boyle, Starkather, and other memorable persons and things. In this way the book has become the panorama of a whole age, centred on the theme Miss Seaton wishes to bring out: the contact with Scandinavia. The material itself keeps the 'literary' aspects of this theme fairly well to the fore; since the main interest lies in the "work of the antiquarians and the learned", and the investigation is concerned chiefly with them.

Scandinavian students and scholars made for England at this time, says Miss Seaton, partly because of the re-orientation the Reformation brought about in the learned world. The attraction of Oxford increased as that of the Catholic universities diminished. But there was nothing like an invasion, and the facts she has elicited do not justify her statement that Scandinavian students "were swarming like bees, to which their ancestors were so often compared", or her image of the "shuttle-like goings and comings of Scandinavian scholars". She does not mention, for example, that the most noteworthy visits, those of Ole Worm, Ole Borch, and Urban Hjärne, were mere detours in academic journeyings whose termini were on the Continent. Yet considered more modestly as detours, they are symptomatic. On their part, English people repaid these scholarly approaches by showing more interest for solid detail than is usual in the international contacts of the learned. Miss Seaton's merit lies in having demonstrated how Scandinavia grew to scientific actuality for a number of English scholars; and the information they took — not only from Saxo and Johannes Magnus, but also from contemporary authorities — about northern antiquities and topographical and philological facts, was put to numerous uses. The correspondence between Sir Henry Spelman and Ole Worm gives us an instructive glance into this circle of interests, this group of scholars doing *litteras septentrionales*. The Elizabethan idea of the mysterious lands of the North gave way to distinct knowledge based on the study of history and geography.

One may ask why interest grew. "It was fortunate for the spread of Scandinavian knowledge that an age of learning in Denmark and in Sweden coincided with an age of antiquarian and learned work in England." One agrees, but could wish the author had gone on to discuss the deeper motivation. The earlier chapters, "Trade and Travel", "Political Ties", "Ambassadors as Liaison-Officers" might have provided indications and fixed starting-points to characterise this English interest in the Northern lands. Seventeenth-century Scandinavia cannot be treated as a homogeneous unit within which these collected references can be placed and discussed



without receiving definite labels. Miss Seaton is not free from some such misapprehension. Her way of including Iceland, Greenland and the Faroes shows that she is working with a loosely hyperborean notion, and not the extremely concrete, politically opposed realities that Denmark and Sweden represented at that time. They were rivals for English support, and the man who figures in Miss Seaton's book only as a 'picturesque suitor' for Elizabeth's hand — Eric XIV — was the first to realise how important an active pro-English policy could be for Sweden. His unsuccessful wooing was a political move to deprive his Baltic rival Denmark of valuable support. In this hunt for English sympathy Denmark was in the better position to push its claims, and it was Denmark that attained closest contact, while Sweden had to be content with an episodic leading part during the Commonwealth. In short, during the former half of the 17th century, both countries felt a pressing need to make themselves known in England, and to interest English opinion in their aims; at the same time the events of the War, especially the career of Gustavus Adolphus, provided effective material for propaganda for and against. "Pamphlets rained upon the land like flights of arrows. It was the harvest-time of the translator." Miss Seaton has here touched upon a problem she has left unresolved, although it must have many points of contact with the work of the antiquarians and the learned. For the pro-Swedish agitation seems to have used arguments that should have interested these circles extremely. Writings such as Hildebrandt's *The Genealogie and Pedigree of the most illustrious and most mighty Kings of Sweden* (transl. 1632), or the anonymous *A Short Survey of the History of Sweden until ... 1632*, justified historically the Swedish policy of expansion by emphasizing the honourable Gothic past of this sudden national creation. Like the quotations Miss Seaton gives from the English eulogies and elegies on Gustavus Adolphus, these ingenious political writings fit in rather well with the literary means used by the propaganda directed from Sweden; and it would have been of interest if the connections could have been clarified. This is so even more of the publication ascribed to Sir Thomas Roe, *The Swedish Intelligencer*, which Miss Seaton makes no attempt to characterise, though she tells us it was in Sion College Library and on Sir Th. Browne's bookshelves; it seems to have had a circulation, and was undoubtedly of great value in popularising information about Gustavus Adolphus's kingdom. The scholars met the spirit of the pamphlets in the 17th century Swedish antiquarians, e.g. Rudbeck. For them the ancient fame and splendour of the Hyperborean lands was axiomatic. Here we have a fruitful contribution to the ideology of the Swedish great-power period, a historical theory in virtue of which the government antedated its authority and legitimised its claims. It must be admitted that to deal with this infiltration into England is a hard task; but the wide and over-elastic limits Miss Seaton has set herself cannot but arouse questions of this kind in the reader. The attention devoted to numerous, wearying trifles makes him feel the absence of concrete historical information as a serious lack. The material being grouped in a series of not strictly delimited chapters, one gets far too many details of secondary interest and far too few positive facts.

In sum, Miss Seaton has fallen a victim to the ambiguity of the word 'literary' in her title. She has used it in the widest possible sense, but her hope has been to show influences in the world of letters in the narrower

sense. She concludes with "The Scandinavian Impress upon English Literature", which boils down to nothing. The fact is, Scandinavian literature then had little to offer English literature; and English literature of that time and before was not known in Sweden — Whitelock found no one with a knowledge of Milton's poetry. Sweden was under German influence. Stiernhielm and Urban Hjärne were made Fellows of the Royal Society, not as men of letters but as the author of *Runa Suethæa* and as a surgeon respectively. Miss Seaton seems to have felt the lack of literary connections in the narrower sense, and to have masked this lack in the superlativisation of irrelevant detail. The examples given above are three among many of an inflated style.

If the book be judged as a scholarly thesis in literary history — and it appears in the promising Oxford Studies — it must be admitted that the result has not justified Miss Seaton's pains. She has tried, to use a septentrional proverb, to pick roses on a barren mountain; yet though there were no roses, one is grateful for this map of the barren mountain. The material would have done better in a shorter, schematic thesis, concentrating on one or two of the fundamental problems; yet this material was not easily collected, and that part of it bearing on the work of the antiquarians and the learned will always have interest and value.

Lund.

GUNNAR AHLSTRÖM.

*Die alttestamentliche Namengebung in England* (mit einem Ausblick auf die alttestamentliche Namengebung in Deutschland und Frankreich). Von Dr. ARNOLD MEIER. (Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten hrsg. von Herbert Schöffler. 22. Band). 55 pp. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz. 1934. R.M. 3.50.

The common use of Old Testament names among the English, particularly in certain classes of society, stands in striking contrast with the nomenclature used in other countries, such as Germany and France. The great mass of Old Testament names in England came into being as a consequence of the Reformation and in particular of the spread of Puritanism. The Reformation gave the impulse, and Puritanism carried on the tendency towards the use of Old Testament names. The author sets himself the task to unravel the causes and the circumstances that led up to the present usage. From c. 1560 onwards Old Testament names grow more and more frequent. Their vogue persisted during the following centuries, and they are still common, though their use is now somewhat restricted. The author correlates the growth of Old Testament nomenclature with the spread of Puritan ideas, showing how throughout the 17th and 18th centuries there was a steady growth in their frequency and noting many curious upshots of Puritan christening. Many names given to children during this period, however, had only a short life; a number of the curiosities noted by the author were not really Old Testament names at all, though there may be some truth in the suggestion that they were formed on patterns from the Bible. The author's interest centres on this period, of which we get a full and vivid account. There can be no doubt that the use of Old Testament names to-day has its main roots in the Puritan movement during the 16th

and 17th centuries, but Old Testament names existed before the Reformation, and I am inclined to believe that the author minimizes their importance. From his remarks on this period, one gets the impression that Old Testament names were rare before the Reformation and that not till after the Reformation was there an appreciable growth in their frequency. Actually, the case is rather different. Old Testament names, like Biblical names generally, were common as early as the 13th century and even then made up a considerable portion of the grand total. Adam is one of the commonest of the names of this period, and so is Simon. David, Elias, Jacob and Samson are somewhat less frequent, but by no means rare; and Jordan is a common name. Occasional examples of Michael, Benjamin, Abraham, Daniel, Job, Joseph, may be met with as early as the 13th century. Some of these are assumed by the author not to occur till after the Reformation. Sarah was a common woman's name: Eve, Mary and Anna also occur. A comprehensive investigation would no doubt bring many more to light. We have to reckon with two strata, one consisting of medieval Old Testament names, which were no doubt partly, if not mainly, introduced from the French; the other dating from after the Reformation and consisting of names taken from the Bible according to the Puritan custom. Both have contributed to the present usage, though the latter stratum is doubtless the more important, or at least has had a more direct influence on the development in England, as compared with France and Germany. This comparison is made in the final chapters of the book.

Lund.

OLOF ANDERSON.

---

*Die Geschichtsauffassung Daniel Defoes.* Von ARNIM BLASS.  
(Heft 72 der *Anglistischen Forschungen*.) 107 pp. Heidelberg:  
Winter. 1931. 6 Mk.

Defoe cannot be numbered among the originators of ideas, the men who gave a new direction to some line of thought. His originality as a thinker — we are not concerned now with his artistic achievement — consisted mainly in an unusual gift for absorbing other people's ideas. He knew how to combine them; in most cases, however, he merely presented them in a personal form, not always devoid of crudeness, that excited the interest of his middle-class reading public. Moreover, he rarely busied himself with ideas in a search after abstract truth; usually he made them serve the purpose of proving some practical point. With a view to these facts we may ask whether there is a justification at all for our occupying ourselves with Defoe's thought. In order to answer this question we do well to remember that there are two important phases in the existence of ideas: their growth and their fate in the subsequent conflict with facts and older existing ideas. Those interested in the first of these processes will be but scantily rewarded for labour spent upon Defoe's writings; the student of the second one, however, will find them rich, almost inexhaustible sources of information. They reflect the foremost problem of his age with rare vividness: the struggle between Protestant orthodoxy, and the forms of life that sprang from it, on the one hand and the tendencies of the new enlightened rationalism on the other. It is this background that renders illuminating the



careful and well written study devoted by Arnim Blass to an analysis of Defoe's views concerning historical subjects. It throws light on Defoe's period and personality notwithstanding, or rather because of, its somewhat negative conclusion to the effect that one looks in vain for an original philosophy of history in the many pages he covered with historical material.

Defoe tried only once to write a book of history in the strict sense of the word: *The History of the Union of Great Britain* (1709), a bulky monument of his incapacity of doing a scholarly historian's work. He was able to produce a fascinating kind of historical journalism, to offer the results of other men's research in a pleasingly diluted form, and made the most of this gift on numerous occasions. These two types of production were by no means the most important of Blass' sources. Defoe's political pamphlets as well as his tracts on other subjects abound in references to historical facts and in judgements on prominent personalities of the past. Blass has laid a great many of them under contribution.

He opens his essay with a chapter on Defoe's personality, outlining his complicated position between the parties in church and state, and indicating those peculiarities of his mind that made him an elusive and self-contradictory figure. Usually, when Blass analyses contradictory remarks of Defoe's concerning a certain topic, his explanations are highly satisfactory. This cannot be said of his interpretation of Defoe's attitude towards Scotland and its church (pp. 3f.). He presents this matter as a first example of Defoe's renowned duplicity. It is not a very striking example: Defoe devoted two volumes to an extremely favourable treatment of Scottish affairs, *Caledonia* (1706), a long poem of praise, and *Memoirs of the Church of Scotland* (1717). Nevertheless, Blass thinks himself justified in stating: "Tatsächlich hatte Defoe keine hohe Meinung von den Schotten." He adduces but slender evidence in support of this view. It is true, on March 18th, 1707, Defoe sent a letter to Harley which contains some critical remarks concerning the northern kingdom. This expression of momentary annoyance was caused by difficulties which Harley's secret agent encountered while he was promoting the cause of the union in Edinburgh, and is therefore not to be taken too seriously. The passage of abuse against Scotland which Blass found in the *Memoirs of a Cavalier* carries even less weight. This book is written in the form of an autobiography. Hatred of Scotland must be considered one of the inevitable characteristics of a cavalier. More plausible than Blass' suggestion appears the view that Defoe, himself a Presbyterian, nursed a lifelong friendship for the church and country of Scotland, a friendship of which he grew particularly conscious in the years before 1720, when it became impossible for him to overlook the fact that an increasing number of members of the Church of England, and of English Nonconformists as well, were losing their orthodox principles in religion. Defoe made several attempts to stem the flood of modernism; one of them was the publication of the *Memoirs of the Church of Scotland*, in which he tried to draw the eyes of his compatriots to the spectacle of a church government that guaranteed supreme and unwavering orthodoxy. This view of the *Memoirs* holds good also if we accept Blass' idea that it was written as early as 1708, when Defoe was more intimately connected with Scottish affairs than at the time of its publication.

The titles of historical books with which Defoe was acquainted are brought together in Blass' second chapter. Then he sets out to give a

description of his author's historical outlook. He places his material under three headings: First he speaks of those of Defoe's ideas that were conditioned by the Puritan tradition, the spiritual power that dominated his youth, and never completely lost its sway over him. He inherited the tendency of comprehending the events of history as workings of either God or the devil. A sketch of the earlier development of this conception is followed by one of Defoe's method of discovering the imprints of the finger of God or the cloven hoof of the devil in the records of human deeds. His *Political History of the Devil* (1726) is treated at some length. Blass tries to ascertain whether there is more seriousness or irony, more of the spirit of orthodox faith or of that of rationalistic doubt in this queer book. He comes to the conclusion that they are both there: Defoe was pretty serious about the devil's existence, but sceptical with respect to the many popular stories about the Evil One which he found in his sources. The final summary of Defoe's rambling book leaves the impression that its unusual scheme served a very good literary purpose: Defoe, in this as true a child of the period of the Enlightenment as Voltaire for example, was deeply convinced of the superior excellence of his own time if he compared it with earlier periods. The events of history rousing his pity or disgust far exceeded in number those that could move him to admiration. His diabolical scheme allowed him freely to give vent to his feelings of disapproval. He exposed the idolatry of the Greeks and Romans, the degeneracy of the Roman form of Christianity, the weaknesses of the popes and saints of the Middle Ages, the foolishness of the crusades, etc. On rare occasions, when Gustaves Adolphus comes to be spoken of for instance, a flash of white relieves the blackness of his picture.

In the second place Blass treats of Defoe's attitude towards history in so far as it can be explained by his political creed. In an elaborate and extremely interesting chapter he shows that this creed was a synthesis of the old patriarchal system and the new idea of the social contract. The troublesome fact is noted that Defoe, an enthusiastic promulgator of the political theories of the Whigs during the first decade of the 18th century, wrote in a more conservative strain ten years later (pp. 70 ff.). Blass explains this new tone as a clever trick our versatile journalist could not help playing, since he found himself obliged to publish articles that looked as if a Tory had composed them. It is doubtful whether this is the whole truth. There is ample evidence for Defoe's disgust at the victory won by religious modernism after George I's accession to the throne. He recognized that the major part of its supporters were Whigs, and therefore adopted a critical attitude towards the theories of a party that had been his own at an earlier moment. There is no need for us to suppose that he had to do himself violence when he was voicing his doubts in the guise of a Tory. Blass' next chapter, rich in characteristic and amusing details, is given to Defoe as a judge of the events of the history of England.

Thirdly, Blass illustrates the influence of his author's intense commercial preoccupations upon his way of looking at history, and thus brings to a close a most valuable contribution to our knowledge of Defoe's mind and period.

*Der Aufgeklärte Puritanismus Daniel Defoes.* Von R. STAMM. (Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, Swiss Studies in English. Herausgegeben von B. Fehr, Zürich; O. Funke, Bern; H. Lüdeke, Basel. I. Band.) 343 pp. Zürich und Leipzig: Max Niehans Verlag. 1936. Swiss Fr. 15.—.

Those who study Defoe's life and works are bound to notice that the views he expresses in his writings are often contradictory and that many of his actions accord ill with the Puritan principles he professes. This divergence forms the subject of Dr. Stamm's work. He gives an account of the typical Puritan trend of thought, showing how in course of time the other-worldliness of the Puritans lessened and how, in the last decades of the 17th century and at the beginning of the 18th, the Dissenters could not altogether escape the influence of the 'Aufklärung'. Dr. Stamm passes in review the different spheres of life and thought, and examines Defoe's political, religious, ethical, aesthetic, and economic opinions to determine how far he remained true to his Puritan principles, how far he was carried along on the rationalistic current, and in what respects he effected a compromise between the old thought and the new.

The habit of considering a problem in the light of unbiassed reason first gained an influence on men of Puritan principles by affecting their political views, and the process once begun did not stop. It taught Defoe to deny the divine right of kings and made him so amenable to the ideology of the Whigs that in his earlier days as a writer, he even adopted deistic views common among them, to support his political theories. He extolled reason to the skies, and the human intellect became to him the measure of all things, even of matters of faith. With the Whigs he claimed liberty of conscience and tolerance, from which, however, he excluded all who were not orthodox Protestants. In later years, aghast at the growth of rationalism in religious opinion, he thundered against all deviation from orthodoxy and accused Reason of leading men astray in religion. In his attitude towards the Anglican Church, Non-Conformity and the Test Act, as well as in the Bangor Controversy, we see two conflicting opinions in his mind, which sometimes even caused him to defend the pro and contra of one and the same question. It is not denied that he may have been influenced by motives of self-interest, especially in the years he worked under Harley and on the staffs of Whig and Tory papers; but Dr. Stamm modifies our opinion of what is known as Defoe's duplicity and opportunism by showing how with the Whig ideals of religious liberty, the Whig ideals of political liberty had become matters of suspicion to Defoe, which explains many attacks on political principles once dear to him.

In religion Defoe is shown to us as a man who by nature secularly-minded, and influenced by the rationalistic current of thought, did not possess the essence of the orthodox Puritan faith, and was unable fully to grasp the idealism of the new religious and philosophical thought. Hence his religion gave him no strength in critical moments, when again and again he was weak and used means beneath the dignity of an honest man. But he did not see this himself, he fought for the orthodox faith, constantly seeking and claiming that he had its support.

The discussion of Defoe's apparitions and warning spirits leads to the



conclusion that they are due to a most remarkable reconciliation of natural law and a belief in predestination.

In ethical matters Defoe propounded a medley of conservative and rationalistic views.

The characteristic Puritan habit of making all things subservient to an end was ingrained in Defoe, yet the direction of his thoughts and actions was different. The Puritan aim was other-worldly, Defoe's keenest interests were worldly, but he pursued them with the same concentration of thought and endeavour as the Puritans pursued theirs, rejecting everything that did not serve his purpose. This is most evident in his attitude towards nature, beauty and art. He did not appreciate these things for their own sakes. He loved music but this he excused by saying that music served a useful purpose. In one respect only this utilitarian forgot himself; in his writings small realistic sketches cropped up and gradually his mind, with its keen interest in things of this world, evolved the non-moral form of realistic art which was to become a more and more important element in his work. Thus Dr. Stamm believes in the spontaneous growth of Defoe's realism and attributes it only partially to an intentional desire to make his books acceptable to his reading public.<sup>1</sup>

Defoe's worldly-mindedness gave him a keen eye for economic problems. He recommended humanitarian and educational measures and certain forms of insurance such as no Puritan of Cromwell's or Bunyan's days would have suggested. Defoe's enthusiasm for trade caused him to waive some Puritan principles.

It is impossible to do justice to all that Dr. Stamm discusses in his book. Suffice it to say that his reasoning is clear and that his assertions are fully proved by numerous interesting quotations from Defoe's works. A new light has been thrown on the remarkable figure whom Professor Trent called a human chameleon. We now see Defoe as a man who did not only deceive and puzzle others but who also deceived himself, whose mind wavered between two extremes and who may have been more sincere than many of his judges have hitherto thought. The reader of Dr. Stamm's study will be grateful to him both because he deepens our insight into Defoe's mind and because a book like his enlarges our knowledge of human nature.

Middelburg.

G. ROORDA.

---

*Englische Sprachphilosophie im spätern 18. Jahrhundert.* Von OTTO FUNKE. (Neujahrsblatt der literarischen Gesellschaft Bern, der neuen Folge 11. Heft.) 162 pp. Bern: Verlag A. Francke A. G. 1934. Fr. 8.50.

We have become accustomed to the idea that modern philology started with the beginning of the 19th century, when it definitely decided to follow the course of historical research. The historical method which at that time

---

<sup>1</sup> On this aspect see an interesting article by the same author: "Daniel Defoe: an Artist in the Puritan Tradition", *Philological Quarterly*, xv, 3, July 1936, 225-246. — Ed.

undoubtedly produced more tangible results than any other thus became the method to examine the structure or rather the development of the living Indo-European languages. As a rule we are hardly aware of this extraordinary on-sidedness and it is only when we use such terms as "pre-scientific" for any period before the age of historical language research that we realise how presumptuous our judgement of the older non-historic methods is apt to be. Is it not a little rash to dismiss the entire work done in what we should now call linguistics for a period of more than 2000 years in order to admire the achievements of one century of historical philology?

Professor Funke's book on *Englische Sprachphilosophie im spätern 18. Jahrhundert* comes as a gentle reminder of some unknown and forgotten paths of linguistics. It may not have been intended as such, but rather as an attempt to show the close connection of late 18th century linguistics with the general philosophical outlook of that age. It is, however, a remarkable fact that Professor Funke, the indefatigable champion of the great outsider Marty, has always been interested in that particular approach to linguistic problems which would never quite fit into the ordinary ways of modern philological research, viz. semantics. Nor is the present book Professor Funke's only one on the history of linguistics.<sup>1</sup> Whoever takes the trouble to look into the pages of pre-scientific philology will be amazed at the wealth of ideas and methods that may be derived from studying those early works. All those who cherish their doubts about the justification of the present order in linguistics will therefore especially welcome the publication of the present volume.

The main thesis of Professor Funke's book is that the clash of 18th century rationalism with the pre-romantic outlook manifests itself in the writings of the philologists of that age as clearly as anywhere. The foundation of the rationalist school is given in the third book of John Locke's *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Locke's views were on the whole, though not entirely, supported and in part even more radically expressed by J. Priestley, Adam Smith, and the Frenchman de Brosses, whereas J. Harris and Lord Monboddo represented what might be called the non-rationalist point of view. Between these two groups Horne Tooke's position combining some of the essential ideas of both but also criticising them may justly be compared with Doctor Johnson's in literature.

The general trend of 18th century linguistics may correctly be described as being dominated by the discussion of two problems, viz., the problem of finding the principles for a universal grammar and the problem of the origin of language.

J. Harris, whose views Professor Funke has set forth in a separate book,<sup>2</sup> believed that the sentence is the proper unit of speech, "a compound quantity of sound significant"; words are symbols of general ideas which in their turn are ultimately of divine origin; Greek takes as a language the highest rank (*Hermes*, 1751).

Adam Smith on the other hand was primarily interested in the psychological aspects of the growth of languages. In his *Considerations concerning the first Formation of Language and the different Genius of*

<sup>1</sup> See O. Funke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Sprachphilosophie*. Bern. 1928. 140 pp. Reviewed in *E. S.*, XI (1929), 224-225.

<sup>2</sup> See O. Funke, *op. cit.* pp. 5-48.

*original and compound Languages* (1759) he maintained that speech is of purely human origin, nouns and verbs were the earliest classes of words and originally represented individual ideas of an entirely concrete character. Only with the development of abstract thinking the two-word sentence came into existence. Smith, too, believed in the absolute superiority of the classical languages.

The high water mark of rationalist linguistics was attained by the publication of J. Priestley's *Course of Lectures on the Theory of Language and Universal Grammar* (1762). In accordance with his general attitude towards science Priestley adhered to the view that the structure and growth of any language was determined by the definite and inevitable laws of nature. "All the words of which languages of men consist are either the names of things or quantities ... or words adapted to denote the relation they bear to one another, or, lastly, a compendium for other words, with or without their relations". Among the reasons for the existing variety of languages he mentioned the differences of what we should now call "cultural situations". In the eyes of Priestley the only way of judging the value of a language is that of taking "the general prevailing custom" as a standard and its relative degree of usefulness as a measure: to him the modern languages do not appear inferior to the classical ones.

The reaction against this rationalist point of view was the publication of one of the biggest works on linguistics, James Burnett, Lord Monboddo's, six volumes *Of the Origin and Progress of Language* (1773-1792). Monboddo sharply criticised Locke's theory of "sensations and reflections", and maintained that general ideas are the products of our creative mind and not a gift of nature. Similarly the physical side of speech has been gradually developed in continual efforts and after a certain stage in the evolution of human society had been attained. The character of primitive speech is purely emotional and the first articulate sound groups indicated "sentences" and not words. Only then were names for things invented. In the classical languages the roots of the "verbs" (which term includes adjectives, participles, prepositions and conjunctions) were a direct creation of the human mind not unlike that of a work of art with a full understanding for the beauty of sound. Greek is the most beautiful and therefore the most valuable language. This definitely aesthetic, if not even romantic view of language questions was again refuted by J. Horne Tooke, who is in many respects certainly the most interesting philologist of the age and to whose *Letter to Mr. Dunning* (1778) and *Diversions of Purley* (1786 and 1805) Professor Funke devotes the second half of his book.

It was Horne Tooke who once said that in a lawsuit he had become the victim of a conjunction and of two prepositions. Horne Tooke realised the tremendous importance of language as an instrument for any "search in philosophical truth" and for all "questions concerning religion and civil law". In fact he believed that the language side of this question was more important than the psychological one. It is this view which distinguishes him from Locke, with whom he otherwise largely agreed. Instead of "general and complex ideas" he would use the expression "general and complex terms". Some of his statements sound extremely modern and will be supported by many logicians of our own days, e.g.: "the business of mind ... extends no further than to receive impressions. What are called its operations are merely the operations of language". The belief



that words are a means of thinking pervades his entire method especially his attitude towards the problem of semantic change. Horne Tooke persisted in the opinion that the original meaning of any word remains wholly unaltered throughout the course of the ages and that all the present categories of words are derivations from either nouns or verbs. This naturally leads to a curiously one-sided aspect of etymology and to the necessity of explaining a number of otherwise inexplicable processes by means of what he called "subaudition" and "abbreviation". The latter is undoubtedly a valuable conception and will be widely accepted in our days: the function of speech is not only "to communicate our thoughts but to do it with dispatch" and "many words are merely abbreviations employed for dispatch and are the signs of other words". Thus Horne Tooke thought that for instance the English word "a debt" was an abbreviation derived from Latin "(aliquid) debitum" and could only be understood correctly through subaudition i.e. the silent realisation that the participle ought to be completed with a (pro)noun. He believed in the danger of an evil influence of language upon thinking: "These words, he said, these Participles and Adjectives not understood as such have caused a metaphysical jargon, and a false morality which can only be dissipated by etymology ... Just, Right and Wrong are merely Participles poetically embodied, and substantiated by those who use them...". Though we should hardly agree that etymology is the way out of these difficulties there is certainly more truth in these statements than even Professor Funke would appear to admit. Word Magic is the term we should apply to the problem which occupied Horne Tooke's mind a century and a half ago. It is the problem which in our own days of intensified political propaganda deserves closer attention than ever, though few philologists realise this as their vital task.

Professor Funke has been an admirable interpreter and a very fair critic of that pre-scientific period in linguistics. His book, which is equally interesting to students of linguistics, philosophy, and literature, will undoubtedly help to widen the philological horizon in general and to encourage those who are in search of new ways in the field of semantics.

Aarau-Zürich.

HEINRICH STRAUMANN.

---

*Matthew Arnold and France. The Poet.* By IRIS ESTHER SELLS, M.A. XV + 282 pp. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1935.. 12s. 6d. net.

With the death of Matthew Arnold in 1888, closely followed by that of Browning (1889), Tennyson (1892) and William Morris (1896), there disappeared a generation, an artistic tendency, a mental attitude. Matthew Arnold, inspector of schools, critic first and foremost, representative of academic poetry, was at the time of his death an outstanding figure, from whom no further development was to be expected. From his masters, the Greeks, Goethe, Wordsworth, he had adopted an attitude of mind which in later years caused him to recoil from his *Empedocles*, to suppress a stanza of Gray's *Elegy* and change "the parting kiss" into "the parting

hour" (p. 108). In him however a young romantic had had his being, a wanderer driven by love during a ramble in Switzerland, an acquaintance of George Sand, an admirer of Maurice de Guérin, of the Sainte-Beuve of *Joseph Delorme*, above all of Pivert de Senancourt. For these "nature's secret was not joy, but peace."

Miss Sells has closely followed the tracks of this lovelorn wanderer, as he ranges the Bernese Oberland and the Valais with Obermann as a guide; in this way she has possibly brought rather too much local colour into her book, too many topographical details in the romance of Marguerite, his French lady-love from Thun, that dream of bliss which in later years did not prevent him from contracting an "eminently happy marriage". But whoever is to some degree familiar with Switzerland, will find plenty of life in these pages, where Miss Sells and Matthew Arnold alternate in commenting on Obermann. At the same time she has been able to show how the poems, which held no connection with Senancour's twin brother, have been leavened with the spirit of Obermann, though I am not sure whether she has succeeded for *The Scholar Gipsy, or Resignation*.

Miss Sells states explicitly (p. 252) that "there has been no question in [her] study of discovering sources"; she probably knows how dangerous this kind of crenology can be, although in her explanations she has had to resort to suppositions for which she fails to furnish proof ("perhaps", p. 65; "perhaps", p. 149; "almost surely", p. 182). Yet she succeeds in placing the poet Matthew Arnold in the "famille d'esprits", to use Sainte-Beuve's phrase, to which he belongs — those who sing "la vie enclose" (oh! the loveliness of *Longing!*); he stands next to Maurice de Guérin, Vigny, Joubert, Amiel, Sainte-Beuve, above all to Senancour, the "master of [his] wandering youth". With great care Miss Sells has studied and demonstrated the parallelism of their two characters and we hope that her book will induce many readers to take up *Obermann* and with him penetrate into his submergence in nature, his search of the permanent, his sorrowful acceptance of that feeling of loneliness, from which, when all is said and done, no man, no thing on earth can deliver him, his submission to fate, which orders "renunciation". Sainte-Beuve, who, like Matthew Arnold, had to devote himself to other work than the kind of poetry of which he was a pioneer, characterized him, to a large extent quite correctly, when he said: "C'était un Français et un romantique égaré là-bas." (That is why I should have liked to see a portrait of Matthew Arnold of 1835 or 1840 instead of the well-known one of 1860.)

"Un Français et un romantique". We know the danger of this kind of general characterization, still we find in this book plenty of passages which show us, notwithstanding the fundamental differences between English and French poetry — so clearly and vigorously revealed by the fine study of H. Peyre, *Shelley en France* — the existence of a parallelism with a certain species of French mentality which influences at least one aspect of the unity of Arnold's artistic personality.

There are occasional digressions (on George Sand, on Senancour, especially on the affair at Thun) which make the book seem rather long. And I should query "*The Centaur* and *The Bacchante* read like lyrical dramatisations of *Obermann*" (p. xiii); Delphine as a woman of genius (p. 13); the view taken of Vigny's stoicism (p. 80); the derivation of Obermann as a man from the Oberland (p. 40); and parallels like those on

pp. 152 and 160. Still at core the book is sound enough; a second volume on the Critic is certain to be more convincing than the dissertation of Paul Furrer (1920) on Sainte-Beuve and Matthew Arnold. In *The Times Literary Supplement* for Febr. 28 and March 7 and 28, 1935, will be found a discussion on data which is of importance for the life of Matthew Arnold.

Amsterdam.

K. R. GALLAS.

## Bibliography

### PERIODICALS

**Publications of the Modern Language Association of America.** L, 1. March 1935. O. Cargill, The Langland Myth. — E. H. Kellogg, Bishop Brunton and the Fable of the Rats. — H. Braddy, The two Petros in the "Monkes Tale." — W. W. Lawrence, Satire in *Sir Thopas*. — J. Burke Severs, The source of Chaucer's *Melibeus*. — J. S. P. Tatlock, The *Canterbury Tales* in 1400. — A. D. Kuersteiner, E. K. is Spenser. — M. Kelley, Milton's debt to Wolleb's *Compendium Theologiae Christianae*. — R. C. Wallerstein, The development of the rhetoric and metre of the heroic couplet, especially in 1625-1645. — C. M. Webster, The satire background of the attack on the Puritans in Swift's *A Tale of a Tub*. — F. M. Smith, The relation of Coleridge's *Ode on Dejection* to Wordsworth's *Ode on Intimations of Immortality*. — M. C. Boatright, Scott's theory and practice concerning the use of the supernatural in prose fiction in relation to the chronology of the Waverley Novels. — J. C. McCloskey, The campaign of periodicals after the War of 1812 for National American literature. — H. H. Watts, Lytton's theories of prose fiction. — R. G. Lillard, Irony in Hardy and Conrad. — **Id.** L, 2. June 1935. H. P. South, "The Question of Halsam." — Th. H. Banks, Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella* reconsidered. — J. M. Purcell, Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella* and Greville's *Cælica*. — R. B. Botting, The composition of the *Shepherd's Calendar*. — F. W. Weitzmann, Notes on the Elizabethan *Elegie*. — J. M. French, Milton as a historian. — Th. P. Harrison, Jr., The Latin Pastorals of Milton and Castiglione. — L. M. Ellison, *Gaudetio Di Lucca*: a forgotten Utopia. — F. B. Snyder, Burns and the smuggler *Rosamond*. — C. C. Moreland, Ritson's Life of Robin Hood. — J. H. Roberts, The significance of *Lamia*. — I. T. Richards, A note on source influences in Shelley's *Cloud* and *Skylark*. — T. H. Vail Molter, A "lost" poem by Arthur Hallam. — H. R. Warfel, Margaret Fuller and Ralph Waldo Emerson. — S. B. Hustvedt, Grundtvig's *Index B* of English and Scottish ballads. C. N. Wenger, An introduction to the æsthetics of literary portraiture. — **Id.** L, 3. Sept. 1935. M. G. Frampton, The date of the flourishing of the "Wakefield Master." — C. Wine, Nathaniel Wood's *Conflict of Conscience*. — H. E. Rollins, Thomas Deloney's Euphuistic learning and *The Forest*. — A. Harbage, Elizabethan and seventeenth-century play manuscripts. — B. D. Brown, Exemplum materials underlying *Macbeth*. — A. Gow, Is Shakespeare's *Much Ado* a revised earlier play? — N. Page, The public repudiation of Hero. — L. King, 2 and 3 *Henry VI* — which Holinshed? — M. G. Christian, Middleton's acquaintance with the *Merrie Conceited Jests of George Peele*. — J. R. Moore, The contemporary significance of Middleton's *Game at Chess*. — A. Watkins-Jones, Bishop Percy, Thomas Warton, and Chatterton's Rowley Poems. (1773-1790). — D. Bush, Notes on Keats's reading. — H. Shine, Carlyle and the German philosophy problem during the year 1826-1827. — **Id.** L, 4. Dec. 1935. Carleton Brown. — A bibliography of Carleton Brown's writings. — S. J. Herben, Jr., Heorot. — G. K. Anderson, Some irregular uses of the instrumental case in Old English. — R. Willard, The Address of the Body to the Soul. — E. C. Fredrick, The date of the *Weneas*. — C. Brown, Chaucer's *Wretched Engendering*. — S. B. Leech, Early application of Latin grammar to English. — H. E. Allen, Influence of superstition on vocabulary: two related examples. — R. M. Smith, Spenser's Irish river stories. — E. S. Parsons, The authorship of the anonymous Life of Milton. — R. G. Ham,



Dryden's dedication for *The Music of the Prophetesse*, 1691. — L. P. Curtis, Forged letters of Laurence Sterne. — J. P. von Gruening, Goethe in American periodicals 1860-1900. — W. L. Schramm, A characteristic of rime. — *Id.* L., 1935. Supplement. American Bibliography for 1935. — *Id.* LI, March 1936. G. W. Small, On the study of Old English Syntax. — G. H. Gerould, The Gawain poet and Dante: a conjecture. — W. Nelson, Skelton's *Speak, Parrot*. — W. McC. Evans, Lawes' version of Shakespeare's sonnet cxvi. — S. Rosenfeld, Dramatic advertisements in the Burney newspapers 1660-1700. — J. C. Hodges, The dating of Congreve's letters. — S. L. Gulick, Jr., The publication of Chesterfield's *Letters to His Son*. — R. M. Davis, "The Correspondents." — E. H. Zeydel, Ludwig Tieck as a translator of English. — T. Scudder, 3d, A chronological list of Emerson's lectures on his British lecture tour of 1847-1848. — E. Atkins, Man and animals in recent poetry. — *Id.* LI, 2. June 1936. H. A. Deferrari, O.F. (Norman) AOI and AVOI, and English AHOY. — M. E. Wells, *The South English Legendary* in its relation to the *Legenda Aurea*. — P. Aiken, Arcite's illness and Vincent of Beauvais. — E. C. Wright, Continuity in xv century English humanism. — W. Nelson, Skelton's quarrel with Wolsey. — H. E. Rollins, Deloney's sources for Euphuistic learning. — R. J. Kane, Joseph Hall and *Work for Chimney-Sweepers*. — J. M. French, Milton as satirist. — G. W. Whiting, A pseudonymous reply to Milton's *Of Prelatical Episcopacy*. — V. H. Ogburn, Further notes on Thomas Percy. — C. R. Sanders, Coleridge, F. D. Maurice, and the distinction between the reason and the understanding. — P. A. Shelley, Benjamin Beresford, literary ambassador. — J. A. Notopoulos, Shelley and Thomas Taylor. — F. Gary, Charlotte Brontë and George Henry Lewes. — H. A. Turner, Hawthorne's literary borrowings. — H. E. Allen, The fifteenth century "Associations of Beasts, Birds and men": the earliest text — with "Language for Carvers." — *Id.* LI, 3. Sept. 1936. R. J. Dean, An Anglo-Norman version of Grosseteste: part of his *Suidas* and *Testamenta XII Patriarcharum*. — A. C. Friend, Chaucer's Prioress' Tale: an early analogue. — E. Casady, A reinterpretation of Surrey's character and actions. — R. Taylor, A tentative chronology of Marlowe's and some other Elizabethan plays. — A. M. Sampley, Plot structure in Peele's plays as a test of authorship. — L. King, Text sources of the Folio and Quarto *Henry VI*. — E. C. Knowlton, Nature and Shakespeare. — M. De Filippis, Milton and Manso: cups or books? — J. S. Dieckhoff, The punctuation of *Comus*. — A. Warren, Crashaw's reputation in the XIX century. — C. E. Ward, The dates of two Dryden plays. — W. Van Lennep, Three unnoticed writings of Swift. — T. Baird, The time-scheme of *Tristram Shandy* and a source. — *Id.* LI, 4. Dec. 1936. — H. E. Allen, The influence of superstition on vocabulary. — D. F. Bond, English legal proverbs. — R. M. Wardle, Thomas Vaughan's influence upon the poetry of Henry Vaughan. — E. D. Seeber, *Oroonoko*, in France in the XVIIIth century. — I. L. Churchill, William Shenstone's share in the preparation of Percy's *Reliques*. — DeLancey Ferguson, Some new Burns letters. — G. R. Potter, Unpublished marginalia in Coleridge's copy of Malthus's *Essay on Population*. — I. J. Kapstein, The symbolism of the wind and the leaves in Shelley's *Ode to the West Wind*. — J. R. Caldwell, The meaning of *Hyperion*. — J. L. Lowes, Moneta's temple. — I. T. Richards, Longfellow in England: unpublished extracts from his journal. — A. W. Read, American projects for an academy to regulate speech. — *Id.* LI, 1936. Supplement. American Bibliography for 1936.

**Studies in Philology.** XXXII, 1. Jan. 1935. B. S. Harrison, The rhetorical inconsistency of Chaucer's Franklin. — R. B. Daniels, Rhetoric in Gower's *To King Henry the Fourth, In Praise of Peace*. — G. W. Whiting, The sources of *Eikonoklastes*: a resurvey. — R. A. Aubin, Three notes on "Graveyard" poetry. — R. T. Fitzhugh, The paradox of Burns' character. — K. L. Knickerbocker, An echo from Browning's second courtship. — *Id.* XXXII, 2. April 1935. Elizabethan Studies: Twentieth Series. R. Jenkins, *Newes Out of Munster*, a document in Spenser's hand. — J. W. Bennett, Spenser's *Fowre Hymnes*: addenda. — C. G. Smith, Spenser's theory of friendship: an Elizabethan commonplace. — D. C. Allen, *The Anatomie of Absurditie*: a study in literary apprenticeship. — J. J. Elson, The non-Shakespearean *Richard II* and Shakespeare's *Henry IV, Part I*. — E. Begg, Shakespeare's debt to Hall and to Holinshed in *Richard III*. — Th. M. Raysor, The aesthetic significance of Shakespeare's handling of time. — R. B. Sharpe, Title-page mottoes in the Poetomachia. — M. Kelley, Milton and the Third Person of the Trinity. — J. I. S. Dieckhoff, Terminal pause in Milton's verse. — W. R. Parker, The *kommos* of Milton's *Samson Agonistes*. — W. F. Thrall, *The Faerie Queene*, "First Part" — in *Variorum*. — H. Craig and D. Patrick, Recent literature of the English Renaissance.

— **Id.** XXXII, 3. July 1935. E. P. Vandiver, Jr., The Elizabethan dramatic parasite. M. Nicolson, The "New Astronomy" and English literary imagination. — C. D. Thorpe, Two Augustans cross the Alps: Dennis and Addison on mountain scenery. — D. H. Bishop, Wordsworth's "hermitage": Racedown or Grasmere? — E. Ebeling, A probable Paracelsian element in Shelley. — **Id.** XXXII, 4. Oct. 1935. A. H. Gilbert, Logic in the Elizabethan drama. — E. H. C. Oliphant, Tourneur and Mr. T. S. Eliot. — G. Williamson, Milton and the Mortalist heresy. — E. Nitchie, Longinus and the theory of poetic imitation in seventeenth and eighteenth century England. — M. P. Wells, Some notes on the early eighteenth-century pantomime. — Ch. R. Sanders, Coleridge as a champion of liberty. — C. R. Decker, Ibsen's literary reputation and Victorian taste. — **Id.** XXXIII, 1. Jan. 1936. M. P. Hamilton, A Latin and English passage on dreams. — M. Trusler, The language of the Wakefield playwright. — P. Aiken, The Summoner's malady. — R. D. Havens, "Wordsworth's 'Hermitage,'" some considerations. — H. Shine, Carlyle's views on the relation between religion and poetry up to 1832. — E. M. Murphy, Carlyle and the Saint-Simonians. — **Id.** XXXIII 2. Elizabethan Studies: Twenty-first Series. H. E. Rollins, Nicholas Breton's *The Works of a Young Wit*, (1577). — V. K. Whitaker, Du Bartas' use of Lucretius. — R. Tuve, Spenser's reading: *The De Claris 'ulicibus*. — I. E. Rathborne, A new source for Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, Book I. — F. Sorenson, Sir Walter Raleigh's marriage. — Y. Z. Chang, Who and what were the Cathayans? — R. A. Law, "Waterish Burgundy." — G. W. Whiting, Woodward's debt to Milton in 1644. — J. M. French, Milton, Needham, and *Mercurius Politicus*. — D. M. Wolfe, Milton's conception of the ruler. — J. O. Eidson, Dryden's criticism of Shakespeare. — H. Craig, Recent literature of the English Renaissance. — **Id.** XXXIII, 3. July 1936. F. Ewen, Criticism of English literature in Grimm's *Correspondance Littéraire*. — R. G. Noyes, Ben Jonson's Masques in the eighteenth century. — B. R. McElderry, Coleridge's plan for completing *Christabel*. — A. L. Strout, James Hogg's *Familiar Anecdotes of Sir Walter Scott*. — Ch. F. Harrold, The nature of Carlyle's Calvinism. — H. Shine, Carlyle's views on the relation between poetry and history up to early 1832. — A. C. Howell, Tennyson's "Palace of Art" — an interpretation. — A. H. Gilbert, Some critical opinions on Milton. — K. Campbell, Recent additions to American literary history: a collective estimate. — **Id.** XXXIII, 4. Oct. 1936. G. F. Sensabaugh, Burton's influence on Ford's *The Lover's Melancholy*. — R. P. Bond, Eighteenth century correspondence: a survey. — Sister M. E. Mousel, Falsetto in Shelley. — C. R. Tracy, Browning's heresies. — A. E. DuBois, Robert Browning, dramatist. — L. S. Friedland, Ferrara and *My Last Duchess*.

**Modern Philology.** XXXII, 1. August 1934. J. H. Hanford and S. R. Watson, Personal allegory in the *Arcadia*: Philisides and Lelius. — L. J. Mills, The meaning of *Edward II*. — H. Drennon, The source of James Thomson's "The Works and Wonders of Almighty Power." — G. L. Marsh and N. I. White, Keats and the periodicals of his time. — R. A. Elmqvist, English medical proverbs. — **Id.** XXXII, 2. Nov. 1934. T. Larsen, A bibliography of the writings of George Peele. — H. M. Jones, The importation of French books in Philadelphia, 1750-1800. — J. DeLancey Ferguson, The earliest obituary of Burns: its authorship and influence. — C. R. Baskervill, A survey of recent books on the Renaissance in England. — **Id.** XXXII, 3. Febr. 1935. M. Nicolson, The telescope and imagination. — A. Warren, Richard Crashaw, "Catechist and Curate." — G. W. Whiting, Rowe's debt to *Paradise Lost*. — A. Friedman, Goldsmith and the *Weekly Magazine*. — J. Fisher, James Hammond and the quatrain of Gray's *Elegy*. — **Id.** XXXII, 4. May 1935. B. Maxwell, *The woman's prize, or The tamer tamed*. — D. Gibson, Jr., On the genesis of *Pilgrim's progress*. — W. K. Chandler, Prior's *Poems*, 1718: a duplicate printing. — F. L. Jones, Shelley's *Leonora*. — Victorian Bibliography for 1934. — **Id.** XXXIII, 1. August 1935. L. Bradner, The Latin translations of Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar*. — H. Baker, Ghosts and guides: Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* and the medieval tragedy. — J. W. Draper, Usury in *The Merchant of Venice*. — W. R. Parker, On Milton's early literary program. — G. Williamson, The rhetorical pattern of neo-classical wit. — J. C. Hodges, On the date of Congreve's birth. — **Id.** XXXIII, 2. Nov. 1935. J. M. Manly, Charles Read Baskervill, 1872-1935. — M. Doran, The Quarto of Kink Lear and Bright's shorthand. — T. F. M. Newton, William Pitts and Queen Anne journalism, I. — A. E. Case, Pope, Addison, and the "Atticus" lines. — **Id.** XXXIII, 3. Febr. 1936. G. K. Chalmers, Three terms of the corpuscularian philosophy. — P. B. Anderson, Mistress Delariviere Manley's biography. — T. F. M. Newton, William Pitts and Queen Anne journalism, II. — W. Huse, A noble savage on the stage. — **Id.** XXXIII,

4. May 1936. W. A. Nitze, Is the Green Knight story a vegetation myth? — J. S. P. Tatlock, Chaucer's *Merchant's Tale*. — Victorian Bibliography for 1935.

**The Yale Review.** XXIV, 1. Autumn 1934. Shane Leslie, Letters of Henry Adams. — S. Leacock, Charles Dickens and Mark Twain. — *Id.* XXIV, 2. Winter 1935. L. E. Richards, Letters of Florence Nightingale. — *Id.* XXIV, 3. Spring 1935. J. C. Ransom, Poets without laurels. — R. C. Binkley, New tools for men of letters. — *Id.* XXV, 1. Autumn 1935. C. B. Tinker, Housman's poetry. — *Id.* XXV, 2. Winter 1936. W. L. Phelps, Mark Twain. — *Id.* XXV, 3. Spring 1936. P. S. Buck, Fiction and the front page. — H. L. Mencken, The American language. — *Id.* XXV, 4. Summer 1936. C. Malaparte, Englishmen and others. — R. M. Hutchins, University education. — V. Barker, Americanism in painting.

**Anglia.** LIX, 1/2. April 1935. H. M. Flasdieck, Untersuchungen über die germanischen schwachen Verben III. Klasse (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Altenglischen). — W. Matthews, Sailors' pronunciation in the second half of the seventeenth century. — L. de la Torre Bueno, Was Ambrose Philips a ballad editor? — W. Krogmann, Ae. *tō-söcning*. — *Id.* LIX, 3/4. Juli 1935. (Johannes Hoops zum 70. Geburtstag.) K. Luick, Zur Palatalisierung. — M. Förster, Zur *i*-Epenthese im Altenglischen. — W. Fischer, *Wanderer* v. 25 und v. 6-7. — H. C. Matthes, Quellenauswertung und Quellenberufung im *Ormulum*. — F. Holthausen, Ein me. Gedicht über die fünf Freuden Marias. — K. Brunner, Ein typisches Bussgedicht aus dem 15. Jahrhundert. — R. Hittmair, Earl Rivers' Einleitung zu seiner Übertragung der *Weisheitssprüche der Philosophen*. — A. Brandl, Von der Auffassung des Todes bei neuenglischen Dichtern. — P. Meissner, Das goldene Zeitalter in der englischen Renaissance. — M. Deutschbein, Die Bedeutungsentwicklung von *road* bei Shakespeare. — W. Keller, Die Entstehung des *Sommernachtstraums*. — A. Schröer, Shakespeareana. — W. Franz, Metrisch-Grammatisches zu Shakespeares *King Lear*. — E. Eckhardt, Robert Davenport's Lustspiel *A new trick to cheat the devil*. — T. Spira, Zum Wesen des Puritanismus. — F. Wild, Zum Problem des Barocks in der englischen Dichtung. — B. Borowski, Die Anspielung auf Avians Fabel *De cupido et invido* in Withers' *Abuses stript and whipt*. — O. L. Jiriczek, Loda in Macphersons *Ossian*. — F. Brie, Tennysons *Ulysses*. — L. von Hübner, Sinclair Lewis und die amerikanische Wirtschaft. — *Id.* LX, 1/2. Jan. 1936. (Wilhelm Horn zum 60. Geburtstag.) T. Spira, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Aufgabe der englischen Studien in Deutschland. — W. Havers, Lautgesetz und Teleologie. — W. Krogmann, Zwei ae. Wortdeutungen. — L. von Hübner, Die Individualität des A. Schreibers (Ms. Arundel 22) der *Secge of Troye*. — E. Eckhardt, Die Quantität einfacher Tonvokale in offener Silbe bei zwei- oder dreisilbigen Wörtern französischer Herkunft im heutigen English (Typus *xx* oder *xxx*). — H. Heuer, Beobachtungen zur Syntax und Stilistik des Adverbs im Neu-englischen. — W. Keller, Zum altenglischen Runengedicht. — F. Holthausen, Ein mittel-englischer Katharinenhymnus von Richard Spalding. — P. Meissner, Empirisches und ideelles Zeiterleben in der englischen Renaissance. — H. C. Matthes, 'Thus conscience does make cowards of us all' (*Hamlet* III, 1). — A. Brandl, Die Herkunft von Manfreds Astarte. — K. Brunner, Griechenland in Byrons Dichtung. — R. Kapp, Können wir aus des englischen Predigt volkstypologische Rückschlüsse ziehen? — W. Fischer, Thornton Wilders *The Bridge of San Luis Rey* und Prosper Mérimées *Le Causse du Saint-Sacrement*. — *Id.* LX, 3/4. Mai 1936. H. M. Flasdieck, Die reduplizierenden Verben des Germanischen (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Altenglischen). — K. Malone, On the etymology of *Lingfield* (Surrey). — W. Krogmann, Ae. Wortdeutungen. — G. Langenfeldt, The OE. Paradise Lost: *neorxnawang*. — H. M. Flasdieck, Zum Lautwert von me. *ē* im 18. Jahrhundert. — E. von Erhardt-Siebold, Aldhelm in possession of the secrets of sericulture. — H. Marquardt, Fürsten- und Kriegerkenning im *Beowulf*. — E. Schröder, Zur Datierung der *Morte Arthure*. — H. Lange, Zu Chaucers *Vogelparlament*. — K. Hammerle, *The Castle of Perseverance* and *Pearl*. — A. E. H. Swaen, The airs and tunes of John Gay's *Polly*. — F. Krog, Butlers *Erewhon*: Eine Utopie? — I. Marinoff, Die Romane Mary Webbs.



# The Antagonism of Forms in the Eighteenth Century (IV)

(Conclusion)

## The New View in Literature

In the antagonism of forms about 1800, one fact impresses itself on the observer. New things had been discovered for the eye: a forgotten world of forms in architecture, a world of beauty, as old as the ground on which they stood — but hitherto unnoticed — by the water-colour painters. Gardeners saw the new visions and theorists tried to formulate their mystery.

Now, if people began to see old things with greater precision, if at the same time that increased precision provided them with an instrument to detect in their old environments new visual facts which they had not seen before and if, on the other hand, they found themselves unable to divorce these new visual facts from their accompanying emotions — and that seems to us to be the lesson taught by the Gothic revival, the school of water-colours, the landscape garden and the picturesque garden — then we might expect a repetition of the same lesson in literature. Obvious questions suggest themselves.

First as to the substance! Do we find a predilection for Gothic stage property in contemporary literature? Do we, in poetry and prose, come across those atmospheric effects with which the English water-colour painters of those days have familiarized us? In other words, was the painter's visual experience shared by his brother artist, the poet? Then as to the manner! Do we meet a naturalism of the free and easy trying to come to terms with the compositional laws and with the mood — affected naturalism in opposition to the unaffected? Does composition sometimes break up into mere patterns? Is there anything in poetry and prose corresponding to the picturesque? Does the Baroque linger on?

All these questions, however, imply a critical limitation, that of approaching the problem from the outside only. But in verbal art issues are complicated by the fact that no expression is conceivable without thoughts marching up for which the sounds are mere tokens, and that these thoughts lead almost automatically to ideas — to ultimates such as appearance and reality, existence and non-existence, change and stability, which again may be referred further back to more final eternalities: love, beauty, mind, spirit, nature, God. Literature here enters right into the multidimensional Suprasensuous which the fine arts only suggest. And so the question arises: Can one trace in literature the road leading from certain sensuous beginnings to those eternalities in such a way as to make us see the first half of the road repeated in the fine arts where the sensuous beginnings are the same, where the end is only a suggestion?

## The Gothic in Literature

The first question has for the greater part already been answered in our section on the Gothic Revival, and anything that might be added to elucidate

the problem has been anticipated in the two excellent monographs by Reinhard Haferkorn<sup>63</sup> and Warren Hunting Smith.<sup>64</sup> The Gothic building as a symbol of medievalism and melancholy or as determining the emotional tone of the background swelled a footnote to Thomas Warton's *Observations on the Fairy Queen* in 1752 into an essay about the nature of the Gothic. It then crept into descriptive letters such as Thomas Gray's epistle to Norton Nicholls in 1764, to whom he speaks in glowing terms of Nettleby Abbey, the most Gothic and most widely sung ruin of those days.<sup>65</sup> But before that the Gothic ruin or tower had made its casual appearance in the verse of Dyer, Thomson, Akenside, Cowper, Collins.<sup>66</sup> In the last third of the century the Gothic building became the most important stage property in the novel of terror,<sup>67</sup> where the chief function assigned to it was that of causing in the reader emotions of the sublime, the awful, and the picturesque in its hackneyed sense. Any estimation of the architectural reality and the aesthetic values of the Gothic — even with such a great descriptive artist as Mrs. Radcliffe — was out of the question. But about 1795 the Gothic was so thoroughly de-emotionalized that not only did it become an object of mockery — for which W. H. Smith, besides the well-known testimony of Jane Austen's *Northanger Abbey*, written in 1798, is able to supply striking examples<sup>68</sup> —, but it was at the same time shifted from its cloud-world into the sober light of realism, so that when Walter Scott began to write about it he looked at the Gothic castle with the eye of an expert, architecturally, as a piece of unaffected naturalism in front of him. "In picturesque qualities and emotional effect, it (i.e. Scott's Gothic architecture) is far inferior to the architecture of Mrs. Radcliffe".<sup>69</sup> Scott marks in literature the same turning-point which we could notice with respect to Gothic interests in the world of architecture where, after incompetent emotional treatment — Strawberry Hill! —, which was in keeping with the cult of Gothic sham ruins in gardens —, technical mastery and scholarly investigation — James Wyatt (d. 1819) and G. D. Whittington (d. 1807) — began to take the field. (See above p. 3).

### From George Keate to John Keats

The series of other questions raised above, the continuity of the Baroque, atmospherics, affected and unaffected naturalism, the free and easy, eternalities — had best be treated not separately but conjointly as we march across the field of literature from 1760 onward, where we shall do well to fix a few dates.

<sup>63</sup> *Gotik und Ruine*, Leipzig 1924 (reviewed in *E. S.*, VII (1925), 23 ff.).

<sup>64</sup> *Architecture in English Fiction*, Oxford 1934.

<sup>65</sup> cf. Smith, l.c. 20, where he might have added to the list of Nettleby poems George Keate's elegy *Nettleby Abbey, 1754*.

<sup>66</sup> s. Haferkorn.

<sup>67</sup> The sociological importance of the novel of terror has been comprehensively dealt with by Jakob Brauchli, *Der englische Schauerroman um 1800 unter Berücksichtigung der unbekannten Bücher*. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Volksliteratur. Doctor's Thesis, Zürich 1928, a book not sufficiently known. Brauchli has been able to trace between 1764 and 1841 some 450 English novels of terror (see his list I) of which about a hundred are castle or tower stories.

<sup>68</sup> p. 163.

<sup>69</sup> W. H. Smith, l.c. 176.

1763, George Keate, *The Alps*.

1783, William Beckford, *Dreams, Waking Thoughts and Incidents*.

1785, William Cowper, *The Task*.

1794, Mrs. Radcliffe, *The Mysteries of Udolpho*.

1798, Wordsworth, *Poems and Ballads*.

1816, Shelley, *Alastor*.

1818, Keats, *Endymion*.

George Keate, although an indifferent poet, supplies answers to more than one of the above questions. It is sufficient to listen to his *Helvetiad* (1756) and his *Alps* to catch in the heavy, almost endless convolutions of his blank verse the tone of the Baroque. His "witches crouching under blasted trees" is a visual replica of a Salvator Rosa picture and his vision of the end of the world foreshadowed in an Alpine tempest betrays by its colossal Miltonic sweep breaking all bounds, combined with the enforced contrast of blackness and flame, the lover of Baroque stock themes. What he has to add of his own is the sensibility of the age, middle-class tears over "virtue in distress." With so much insistence on the gloomy, the solemn, and the awful no precise touch is to be expected.

But this preciser touch combined with the Baroque grandeur is to be found some thirty years later in the works of Mrs. Radcliffe. The Baroque betrays itself in her glorification of the vertical and the gigantic and the sublime, which, together with grandeur, were hackneyed terms with her. "Adeline gazed with emotion on the most sublime, on the boundless expanse of waters that spread on all sides; ... the grandeur and immensity of the view astonished and overpowered her".<sup>70</sup> But Mrs. Radcliffe was on the point of outgrowing the Baroque. Having indulged in ecstasies of the sublime, the grand, the immense, the tempestuous, and their cousins, the majestic, the vast, the dreadful, the tremendous, the terrible, the awful, the gloomy, all of which she summed up once or twice under the vague term of the romantic, she enlarged her scale by moods unknown to the Baroque, melancholy, the luxury of grief, sweetness, tranquillity. This meant that the one stereotyped emotion which the Baroque artist would fling operatically into his moving vision, was to be substituted by a wider range of feelings, of which just one might be inherent to a given scene at a given moment. Mrs. Radcliffe valued each landscape for the emotions or perhaps the newness of an emotion it was able to stir within her. "How often did she wish to express to him the new emotions which this astonishing scenery awakened".<sup>71</sup>

But Mrs. Radcliffe outgrew the Baroque in another sense. Do we not feel in chapter after chapter the neighbourhood of Gilpin and Repton, whose rules, without thinking or knowing of them, she would instinctively apply? She is always out for contrasts of light and shade, for what we have called Gilpin's third critical mould (s. above p. 9). That such a device was not a matter of course with topographical writers of those days is proved by a juxtaposition of two descriptions of the same scene, the one by Mrs. Radcliffe, the other by Mrs. Piozzi, the former the copy, the latter the source.<sup>72</sup>

<sup>70</sup> All our Radcliffe quotations are taken from Vasil Moesch, *Naturschau und Naturgefühl in den Romanen der Mrs. Radcliffe und in der zeitgenössischen englischen Reise-literatur*, Dissertation, Zürich, 1924 — which contains a wealth of information (p. 53).

<sup>71</sup> Moesch, l.c. 77.

<sup>72</sup> as was proved by Clara F. McIntyre, *Ann Radcliffe in Relation to her Time*, New Haven, 1920, p. 60. Reprinted by Moesch, l.c. 93.



## Piozzi

The sublimity of their architecture, however, the magnificence of their orangeries, the happy construction of the cool arcades and general air of festivity which breathes upon the banks of this truly wizard stream, planted with dancing, not weeping willows, to which on a bright evening the lads and lasses run for shelter from the sunbeams ...

## Radcliffe

The grandeur of the Palladian villas, that adorn these shores, was considerably heightened by the setting rays, which threw *strong contrasts of light and shade* upon the porticos and long arcades, and beamed a mellow lustre upon the orangeries and tall groves of pine and cypress that overhung the buildings.

Mrs. Piozzi's unilateral landscape rendering has been transposed by Mrs. Radcliffe into a light and shade contrast. Mrs. Radcliffe was, moreover, astonishingly alive to the truth of Repton's observation as to varying changes effected in the appearance of objects by the caprice of an ever-shifting light. "On every side appeared the majestic summits of the Pyrenees; some exhibiting tremendous crags of marble, whose appearance was *changing every instant as the varying lights* fell upon their surface".<sup>73</sup> But this is not all. She seems to have been aware not only of all the varying tints but of the illusion of these hues being blended into one unifying tone by the magician light, if a passage like the following allows of an interpretation which points ahead to the English water-colour painters, if not to Constable. "The plain was coloured with the riches of cultivation, whose *mingled hues were mellowed into harmony by an Italian sun*".<sup>74</sup>

Lastly, Mrs. Radcliffe lifted the sublimity, immensity, majesty, stupendousness, beauty and serenity of the scenes she had witnessed into a realm of ideas where she linked them up with the ultimate eternality, the deistic God of the earlier century, not the dispassionate clockmaker, but the father of all good.<sup>75</sup>

While she was applying the new mode of seeing to the painting of backgrounds in the English novel, William Cowper carried the same mode into the smaller visual world of his verse, to lend it colour by moods differing considerably in size and number from Mrs. Radcliffe's. When we listen to his invocation to Evening in the *Task*, Book IV, we believe ourselves thrown back into the gigantic imagery and the twists and slow convolutions of Baroque English blank verse. Cowper employed it in moments of solemnity, which seemed best expressed through an instrument shaped and left behind for use by the Baroque poets. But such moments are rare with him. In the long amplitudes of his blank verse with its frequent metrical overlappings we feel no longer the stretching and wrenching of the Baroque movement. The well-known run-on lines reflecting the undulations of the river Ouse (Bk. I) are no more yoked into the service of Baroque suspense but convey an easy-going communication. Not only has the torturing tension been released, the tempo is relieved of its heaviness. The ponderously treading pathos of Milton and Thomson has given way to the lighter steps of a kindly disposed, homely sensibility. The Largo has passed over into an Andantino. But there are other hints of a change in Cowper's verse. The "time-vesture" has a new aspect. For Cowper the long colonnade was a "monument of an ancient taste, now scorned". And the new taste was for that nature which was like a big

<sup>73</sup> Moesch, l.c. 52.

<sup>74</sup> Moesch, l.c. 50.

<sup>75</sup> Moesch, l.c. 64-69.

garden and that garden which was like a piece of nature. Reading Cowper we are reminded of the topographical prints of the Sandby school, portions of landscape always animated by human figures, a device so much in favour in Cowper's days (s. above p. 6). There is the gipsy family on the fringe of the forest, there is the woodman on his way to work, there is the waggoner, driving homeward from the sun-burnt hay-field, and there, between tall elms, the thresher is seen thumping his flail.

But there are, moreover, hints in Cowper's *Task* of a rare insight into the mysterious ways of colour and light. The first book offers two passages near each other, one revealing the poet's observant eye for the manifold shades of green in willow, poplar, ash, elm, oak, maple, beech, lime and sycamore, the other, the more surprising one, showing a Cowper who is able to catch in the mirror of language the sportiveness of light beneath a shady avenue:

So sportive is the light  
Shot through the boughs, it dances as they dance,  
Shadow and sunshine intermingling quick,  
And dark'ning and enlight'ning, as the leaves  
Play wanton, ev'ry moment, ev'ry spot.

These lines, the uniqueness of which was first pointed out by Sainte-Beuve in his *Causeries du lundi* (vol. XI, 180), presuppose a pair of eyes beginning to see the same new visual facts that the water-colour painters of those days were discovering for themselves and for their art.

The road leading from such facts to their Christian Maker was simple enough for Cowper, but less simple was the antagonism of Good and Evil, to which he saw a parallel in the Country and the Town.

But the thought of the age was pointing away not only from the simplicity of that road but also from the simplicity of the ultimate; it was striving for a new kind of affirmation, which William Wordsworth was the first to pronounce. In fact, Wordsworth has been judged by literary criticism not so much for the new mode of seeing with which he came in touch as for the metaphysical result of his visual and emotional experience in the course of his youth and earlier manhood. The landmarks of that experience were the Christian Maker, the emanative pantheistic All-Oneness, and ultimately the pantheistic idea re-adapted to Christian orthodoxy, or in other words: a Wordsworth standing in 1790 on the height of the Simplon pass with all his soul "turned to Him who produced the terrible majesty before" him,<sup>76</sup> a Wordsworth standing in 1798 above Tintern Abbey uttering his well-known affirmation: "And I have felt ... a motion and a spirit that impels all thinking things" — and lastly a Wordsworth getting steadier, sitting in his study, crossing out the pantheistic passages of his *Prelude* and making them conform.<sup>77</sup>

So far, we have only watched the shaping of the Victorian Wordsworth. But where is the Wordsworth who, like the painters, gardeners and picturesque cranks, looked out into a world on the verge of change? We

<sup>76</sup> Letter to Dorothy W., Sept. 1790 (*Letters of the Wordsworth Family*, ed. Knight, Boston 1907).

<sup>77</sup> Cf. Alois Brandl, *Zwischen Inn und Themse*, Berlin 1936, p. 153. In his *Memoirs* Brandl mentions his interview with the bishop of Lincoln, Christopher Wordsworth, 1880, who protested against his cousin being called a pantheist.

shall best grasp the nature of that Wordsworth who was a struggler for forms if we compare him with his literary neighbour, Mrs. Radcliffe. With her he shared the idea that a scene was there to arouse emotions. The Wordsworth of 1790 did not go beyond Mrs. Radcliffe's Baroque repertory: the sublime, the terrible, the majestic, the stormy. By 1798 we find the emotional scale enlarged by a new range of feelings, some of them of subtle distinctions and sharply defined: beside vague terms such as wild ecstasies, dizzy raptures, we note the new conception of a thing of nature being for him a passion, an appetite, a feeling, a love, the novel experience of a grandeur in the beatings of the heart, of blood flowing for its own pleasure, and an ever stronger insistence on a sense of motion without and within him. But now the surprising fact is that for 1798 and the years after, Wordsworth desires us to look upon this large emotional scale in a purely retrospective sense. The feelings were gone, and "sensations" had been transformed into "ideas of sensations" and ultimately into "ideas",<sup>78</sup> the greatest of which was the "supreme existence" of God.

Whenever Wordsworth — although in emotional retrospectiveness — utters his solemn cosmic affirmations he makes use of the Miltonic grand tone, a kind of discursive Baroque evolving itself endlessly — *Tintern Abbey*: I have felt ..., and *Prelude* XIV, 63-129!

But against this Wordsworth of argumentative grandeur there is a Wordsworth striving for the free and easy, for the simple values of the language of everyday. The volume bringing *Tintern Abbey* in the end also contained *Peter Bell*, where an attempt was made to lower the tone to an almost colloquial key, to paint the natural scene in a few simple patches:

Where blue and grey and tender green,  
Together make as sweet a scene  
As ever human eye did view.

— and to let the philosophy move on homely lines (Peter opening his hardened heart to the affections under the stress of natural beauty):

and Peter Bell, the ruffian wild,  
Sobs loud, he sobs even like a child.

This is the Wordsworth of the common reader. The flow of speech is broken up into the normal steps of the ballad metre in its various modifications or of the frequently running-on rhymed couplets of the iambic tetrameter (*The Sailor's Mother*, *To the Cuckoo*, *The Waggoner*, *To a Butterfly*, *I Wandered Lonely as a Cloud*). And these normal steps are naturally adapted to the smaller things which build themselves up with the march of sounds, as for instance the thorn covering its branches with lichens and hiding its stem in the embrace of the creeping mosses. But this walking step is less frequent with Wordsworth than his sweeping long-breathed movement. A closer study shows him capable of many stylistic types. But the two we have dealt with are the most striking and in 1798 they existed side by side in the same brain.

Wordsworth's art was an affected naturalism spiritualized by his idea of All-One-ness. The more subtle perceptual results, the mastery of the

---

<sup>78</sup> Hartley's doctrine (cp. A. Beatty, *W. Wordsworth, his doctrine and art in their historical relations*, Madison, Wis., 1922.).



atmospheric mystery achieved by contemporary landscape painters, did not affect his poetry to any great extent. But the painters' sensibility was not lost on all poets. It was shared by two writers whom it is not usual to bring together: Beckford and Shelley.

William Beckford in his *Dreams, Waking Thoughts and Incidents* (1783) reveals himself as a visionary who loved to glide across a landscape with his eyes half shut in a dream-like state so as to be able to take in the silvery haziness of the sky with its hidden luminous vibrations — a method, by the way, adopted by some of the French impressionists, who would look at a landscape deliberately through half-closed eyelids in order to obtain a general effect of diffuseness and blurred contours.<sup>79</sup>

A frequent mist hovers before my eyes, and through its medium, I see objects so faint and hazy, that both their colours and forms are apt to delude me ... The evening sun, scarcely gleaming through hazy clouds, cast a pale, tender hue upon the landscape ... A few gloomy vapours, I can hardly call them clouds, rested upon the extremities of the landscape; and through this medium the sun cast an oblique and dewy ray ... The serene moonlight on the pale grey tints of the olive, gave an elysian, visionary appearance to the landscape. I never beheld so mild a sky, nor such soft gleams: the mountains were veiled in azure mists ... and the plains in vapour ... that diffused a faint aërial hue to which no description can render justice.

But it should be noted that this cult of diffused light is confined to his *Dreams*. Neither *Vathek* (1783) nor his *Sketches of Spain and Portugal* (1833) show traces of it — excepting a few stray passages.

When we come to Shelley we find a poet willing to give up his personality if by so doing he might identify himself with things around him. So he expressed a world which sensuously was the utterance of what Constable, the painter of the hour, and Turner, the landscape visionary, were pronouncing in colours, and a world which spiritually seemed to harmonize with their suprasensuous suggestions. Shelley by diffusing his loving self in the universe — "this world, this Me" — made it the emanation of the infinite idea of love. The whole world of appearances was composed of the "exhalations" and vibrations of Eros. In this way he gave his philosophy that visible foreground which for his two contemporaries was like the eternal illusion of an undying power rushing every moment into millions of forms and leaving them again in the same moment. Shelley's sensibility was that of the atmosphere painters.

It is the merit of M. André Chevrillon to have first pointed out in an essay of deep critical insight<sup>80</sup> the perceptive affinity between Shelley and the landscape painters. He places him by the side of Claude Monet, the French impressionist famous for his "valeurs". An obvious modification of this statement will enable us to see in Shelley the spiritual brother of Constable and of Turner, — of Constable for his "valeurs", the extended register of his high notes, of Turner for the fluidity of his forms which seem diluted in the eternal essence of light moving everywhere, for his universal "interpenetration" — the corresponding verb is a favourite with Shelley —, suggestive of Shelley's pantheistic and panpsychic vision. Here the painter's "suggestion" (see above p. 49) has met the poet's "idea"

<sup>79</sup> The writer is indebted for the following quotations to a thesis by Sylvia Hauser, *Die Entwicklung der Landschaftsschau in der englischen Reiseliteratur 1700-1850*, Zürich 1937, which is in print now.

<sup>80</sup> *La nature dans la poésie de Shelley (Etudes Anglaises, 1910, p. 83-84).*

more than halfway. The reality of *Alastor* is to be looked for in the twilight and silence weaving their aerial mysteries, "sailing among the shades like vaporous shapes half seen", much rather than in its philosophic scheme, which is contradictory.<sup>81</sup> Shelley sent his quivering soul into the ever-present cosmic influences, waves of light, colour and odour:

The quivering vapours of dim noontide,  
Which like a sea o'er the warm earth glide,  
In which every sound, and odour, and beam,  
Move, as reeds in a single stream —<sup>82</sup>

the very influences his contemporary landscape painters were eager to express.

We look in vain for such an identity of aims in the poetry of John Keats. And yet Keats is connected with the fine arts, as has been amply proved by Sidney Colvin. Only his connection points another way, towards Claude Lorrain and antique sculpture. But first of all he had been a constant visitor to that endless gallery where the poetic words created by Spenser, Chapman, Shakespeare and Milton, would enticingly smile on him like portraits by old masters. This was the view of Amy Lowell, which has been corroborated by Professor Caroline Spurgeon's startling discovery, at least as far as Shakespeare is concerned. And if we read Keats' letters written in 1819, we find the above view confirmed — through exclusion of the false — by Keats himself. "I'm getting a great dislike of the picturesque" ... "I'm tired of scenery" ... "But the sea, Jack, the sea". In other words, Keats was not affected by the new mode of seeing. Landscape, as a subject for art, might interest the water-colour painters but not him<sup>83</sup> — except the sea, a great symbol for his "vast idea," the divine sisterhood of truth and beauty. So in his frequent peeps into landscapes — as in *Endymion* — it is not those landscapes themselves that matter because they never complete themselves, but the closely knitted impressions, sensations and emotions proceeding from landscape phenomena and translating themselves into a poetic world for the building up of which Keats borrowed his verbal and pictorial material from Spenser and Shakespeare. The "arbour, overwove By many a summer's silent fingering; To whose cool bosom she was us'd to bring Her playmates" is not intended to be brought before us as a painter would see it, but as a "silvery enchantment" stirring luxurious sensations, where the words themselves as mere sounds are the prime movers and the images the secondary movers. In this way a double world is created, a world of words, a world of vision. And the vision again is threefold: visual (arbour), auditive (silent), tactile (fingering and cool).<sup>84</sup> Moreover, the arbour has become the supreme type of all sensuously exquisite arbours in the same way as that bit of storm where "all the billows green Toss'd up the silver spume against the clouds" is a condensed sea-piece, sharply

<sup>81</sup> As is proved by an exact reading of the text. (R. D. Havens, *Shelley's Alastor* in P.M.L.A., vol. XLV, 1930, 1098-1115).

<sup>82</sup> *The Sensitive Plant*.

<sup>83</sup> In J. W. Beach, *The Concept of Nature in 19th century English Poetry*, New York, 1936 — there is one page on Keats beside long chapters on others, which shows that Nature does not enter largely into Keats' outlook.

<sup>84</sup> How frequently is it also osmatic: "So canopied lay an untasted feast Teeming with odours". Threefold: visual, gustative, osmatic.

contoured and not filmy, not in any way suggestive of Constable or Turner, but again an eternal type expressed in terms of pure poetry. Not a Turner but a Giorgione might have painted it. Keats adapted his eyes to a pre-Baroque mode of seeing, with which, however, according to Mary Suddard,<sup>85</sup> he could not completely identify himself. Set a Spenser stanza written by the master beside one taken out of the *Eve of St. Agnes* and the fundamental difference between closeness and looseness will become evident. This difference partly expresses itself in run-on lines. Keats has introduced modern movement into the old classic structure. His imagery and his verbal material were Renaissance but his steps had modern lightness and gracefulness. He was at his ease with the heroic couplet, which, like Leigh Hunt, he handled with perfect freedom, allowing the current of speech to run round the metrical corners as if there were no rhymes. He did so in *Endymion* and again in *Lamia*, where according to Mary Suddard he had reached the highest level of sustained intellectual power. Therefore the old question may here be raised again. Why did Keats, when he was well on the way toward spiritualizing his vision, break off his *Hyperion* twice? Was it not the choice of a wrong medium, Milton's Baroque blank-verse, the heavy movement of which Keats kept up well enough until he must have realised that he was walking in steps entirely foreign to his nature?

With Keats, the poet of the three- and fourfold vision, who, as far as we could see, seems to stand outside the antagonism of forms at the beginning of the 19th century, we will conclude our lectures. Let us hope that the comparing of notes among artists and poets has not been in vain.<sup>86</sup>

Zürich.

BERNHARD FEHR.

<sup>85</sup> Mary Suddard, *Studies and Essays in English Literature*, C.U.P., 1912, p. 82-85 (in her essays on Keats of an astonishing artistic sensitiveness.)

<sup>86</sup> Corrections and Addenda. On page 118 (of vol. XVIII), line 10 from the bottom, read 1625 for 1652. But 1619 for 1625 would be a fitter date (Inigo Jones' Banqueting Hall). — P. 119: Grinling Gibbons was born in Rotterdam and came to England in 1667 when he was twenty-four. (Montizambert, *Unnoticed London*, p. 195). — P. 121: Verrio and Laguerre. The walls and ceilings of the North Staircase of Wollaton Hall, Notts., were probably painted by those two Baroque artists (Tipping, vol. III, II p. 412, mentions pictures on the walls and ceiling of Swakeleys, Middlesex, in the manner of Verrio, but earlier, very likely by an Englishman, Robert Streater.) — On p. 195, l. 26, please do read *basin* for *basis*. L. 5 from the bottom read Vegetation. — On p. 197 just below the middle read: *and* has a continuing, or a parallelizing function (not: or). — On p. 202, in the quotation in the middle read: *failing* breath, not: *failing breath*. — On p. 2 (xix) l. 16-18 delete inverted commas at the beginning and end of the sentence. — On p. 13, l. 26 read: with its Chinese bridge in wood and its classic bridge in stone.

I cannot conclude these notes without expressing my cordial thanks to Mrs. Florence Maly-Schlatter, a pupil of mine and a student of Fine Art, for her valuable hints with respect to those parts of my lectures which had to do with architecture, painting and gardening — and for her indefatigable help in selecting, when in London, suitable subjects for slides.



# Linguistic Theory

## Reply to some Critics

Nearly five years have passed since the appearance of my book on *The Theory of Speech and Language* (Oxford, 1932), and the interval has provided ample opportunity of observing the reactions of philologists and others. Roughly speaking, my critics may be ranged in three categories: first, those who think all I have written so obvious that they deplore the spilling of so much good ink; second, those to whom my argumentation seems so abstruse that they can make neither head nor tail of it; and lastly, those who have understood wholly or in part what I was driving at. The first judgement has come from scholars whose personal achievement in different fields I deeply admire, and clearly it is the most devastating of the three. However, the views expressed by other no less deeply respected colleagues encourage me to hope that the first-named were mistaken, and that they judged as they did either because they had no interest in linguistic theory, or else because they were unaware of the obscurity in regard to its fundamental problems existing in the minds of many competent students. Since the very topic of my book has thus been called in question, I may perhaps be permitted a personal explanation. The book originated in the intense discomfort caused by my ignorance of the exact purport and validity of many terms which my researches constantly compelled me to use. I felt that I ought to possess a secure theoretical framework within which my special researches could be safely carried on. Study of the works of Paul, Wundt and others failed to satisfy. Wegener's book, on the contrary, was a revelation.<sup>1</sup> My own conclusions were reached with the utmost difficulty, and the formulation of them in coherent English often seemed beyond my powers. Thus the aim of my book was not to propound any new or startling views, but rather so to floodlight the obvious truths of linguistic theory that they could not conceivably be overlooked. Were it not for the frivolity of such a title, I should have liked to name my book "What every Young Philologist ought to know, and what no Old Philologist ought to have forgotten". It is perfectly true, as Leo Spitzer has pointed out,<sup>2</sup> that others have emphasized the difference between 'meaning' and 'thing-meant', the purposiveness of speech, the attitude of speaker to listener, and so forth. *But the real difficulty lay in relating these elements to one another and in remaining acutely aware of all of them at one and the same time.* That is the service which the writing of my book has rendered to myself, and I can honestly declare that since writing it I often find myself appealing, alike in my personal studies and in discussion with others, to this or that principle of linguistic theory there set forth, and not, so far as I know, clearly put in its proper perspective anywhere else.

Since the appearance of my work, only two full-dress treatises on

<sup>1</sup> I read de Saussure's now famous *Cours de linguistique* shortly after its first appearance, and at that time found it extraordinarily obscure. It was not until my own volume was out that I studied de Saussure again consecutively, and only then did I discover how much, though quite subconsciously, I really owed to him. It is a matter of justice to a great thinker that I should now openly admit my indebtedness, and express the regret that I did not earlier become aware of it.

<sup>2</sup> *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, Oct. 16th., 1932, col. 1985.

linguistic theory that take account of it have appeared, namely Karl Bühler's *Sprachtheorie* (Jena, 1934) and J. R. Kantor's *Objective Psychology of Grammar* (Indiana Univ., 1936). With the former I shall possibly deal elsewhere, but of the second I will write now and nevermore. I have little patience with that kind of psychology which starts with a denial of the existence of its own proper subject-matter, namely mind. However difficult it may be to observe mental phenomena with scientific accuracy, it is an absurd overstatement to assert, as Kantor does, that "absolutely no observation of this psychic factor is possible" (p. 57). Whenever we feel something, see something, or will something, and know that we are doing so, *ipso facto* we are observing the working of our minds, and Kantor's statement to the contrary, admittedly the groundwork of his so-called Psychology of Grammar, stultifies it in advance. Much nearer the truth is Funke's diametrically contradictory statement in this periodical: "The only world of 'reality' directly accessible to us is that of our mind, i.e. our own psychical phenomena; the so-called 'external' world and the world of matter are never given to us directly or immediately, and they can or are believed to be reached by us only through the medium of our mental plane."<sup>3</sup>

The words just quoted are taken from an article "On the Function of Naming" which refers to my book in highly complimentary terms, but none the less attacks some of its central positions. I should be sorry if the fact that I here single out for reply Funke and two other scholars who have been equally complimentary were interpreted as a sign of ingratitude for the praise I have received at their hands. My motive has been very different. The pains that they have bestowed upon my book bear witness to their interest in its problems and their desire to see these clarified. With such zealous searchers after truth it is a privilege to break a lance. Funke's article discusses the manner and degree in which 'speech' and 'language' — he is at one with me in making the distinction<sup>4</sup> — can refer to 'things' as opposed to mere 'presentations' (*Vorstellungen*). His conclusion is that 'the function of naming', i.e. actual predication, or in my phraseology, reference to 'things' by means of words, "belongs to speech and not to language"; "it is the sentence which performs the naming function, and it is by help of this context that 'names' partake in the reference to things".

These two propositions are nearly synonymous on their positive side, and in passing I note with pleasure that Funke evidently agrees with me in regarding the sentence as the unit of 'speech'. However, the way in which he enounces his thesis suggests a belief on his part that this view is somehow opposed to my own. But surely my doctrine of the 'thing-meant' as one of the four factors of 'speech',<sup>5</sup> as well as the return to the same problem in my second chapter,<sup>6</sup> where I analyse a single simple utterance, ought to have made clear my conviction that the principal function of 'speech' is reference to 'things'. As regards the negative part of Funke's contention, to the effect that the function of naming does not belong to 'language', which

<sup>3</sup> "On the Function of Naming", in *English Studies*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 57-62.

<sup>4</sup> In a paper read before the Congress of Linguists in Rome (*Atti del III Congresso*, pp. 345-53) I have endeavoured to define this distinction even more closely than I did in my book.

<sup>5</sup> *Speech and Language*, ch. 1, especially § 8.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, § 27.

he defines with rough accuracy as 'the habitually acquired speech-system', I have not expressed any definite opinion, nor could I do so unless I were sure of the implications of his term 'naming'. I am naturally more at home with my own terminology than with his, and if I am permitted to use the former, I shall not be at a loss to state my view. In 'language' as a body of knowledge existing outside and apart from the activity of 'speech', it is evident that there can be no 'things-meant', since 'meant' here signifies 'purposely referred to by a given speaker', and from 'language' thus conceived the whole apparatus of speaker, speaker's purpose, listener, and things-to-which-reference-is-desired, is obviously absent. Nevertheless, there is clearly a sense in which 'words' (the units of 'language') refer to 'things', namely in the sense that a word in my possession sums up my *previous* experiences of a number of similar things (class-names like *hat*) or my previous different experiences of one and the same thing (proper names, abstract nouns)<sup>7</sup>. Such passive reference to things is what I call 'word-meaning' or simply 'meaning'.<sup>8</sup> Thus, if what Funke calls 'naming' signifies no more than 'refer to', then 'naming' does exist in 'language' apart from 'speech', only in a much more generalized and non-purposive manner. It is worth while noting the corollary to this state of affairs: in any given sentence a word refers to 'things' in two different ways; firstly, it refers to something specific here and now intended by the speaker (my 'thing-meant'); and secondly it refers to such previous experiences on the part of the speaker as constitute the class of thing intended and as enable the word to serve as the clue to that thing. And since the 'word' as it occurs in 'speech' is, no less than the whole sentence, intentionally used by the speaker, we shall find it not inappropriate to describe a word-meaning when employed in any specific sentence as the 'proximate thing-meant' and the thing ultimately intended as the 'ultimate thing-meant'.<sup>9</sup>

However, the real issue between Funke and myself is that whereas I regard as 'things' whatsoever can be referred to by speech, he is not willing to go so far. We have seen from his own admission that some things can be referred to (or 'named') by words, but apparently he confines this function to those words which he calls 'autosemantic', i.e. "word-sentences, concrete nouns, and most of the substantival pronouns." The very sane remarks which I have quoted from him as to the only world of 'reality' directly accessible to us are followed by a proposition far more questionable: "Applied to linguistics, that is to denote that in speech the factor of meaning must be considered as the primary one and the factor of the thing-meant as the derived or secondary one, however strange such a view may seem at first sight and will always be to the ordinary speaker". I must protest against the misuse here of terms which are evidently a

---

<sup>7</sup> I will merely recall, but not discuss, my contention that proper names and abstract nouns are also class-names in the sense that their 'meaning' is derived from a large number of separate experiences, each of which can be regarded as a member of the class, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

<sup>8</sup> *Op. cit.*, §§ 12, 26 and particularly p. 74. If it should be objected that I use the verb 'mean' in the sense of 'intend' in the term 'thing-meant', but not in the term 'meaning', I should reply that the separate experiences that have gone to build up the 'meaning' have each and all been at some time or other the outcome of some speaker's intention.

<sup>9</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 255-60. I venture to call especial attention to these pages, since in them I have sought to explain the true basis of linguistic predication.



concession to the terminology of my book. In that book 'meaning' means 'word-meaning' and has nothing to do with the 'thinginess' or 'non-thinginess' (i.e. mental and conceptual character) of what I call the 'thing-meant'. Funke's subsequent observations show that the latter problem is what he has in mind: "When the author (i.e. Gardiner) declares: 'The statement that speech serves to express thought simply ignores the fact that I can speak about this pen with which I am writing, about my house, my books, my family, and, in short, about everything else in the world', it seems to me evident in all such cases that speaker as well as listener must first of all think about something, be mentally occupied with something, affirm or deny something, react emotionally to something and express these same mental attitudes in words before a mutual understanding can take place." This must, of course, be granted, and Funke admits that I am aware of it, though he wrongly imagines I have acknowledged it only at a rather late stage in my book (pp. 152-3). In point of fact a whole paragraph was devoted to the point in my first discussion of thoughts *versus* things (p. 28). For lack of space, I will quote only one unphilosophically expressed, but I believe adequate, sentence: "When a speaker refers to anything, he has first to see it mirrored in his mind, and similarly when a listener apprehends anything, he has first to see it mirrored in his mind." Funke's personal impression is, however, that in the earlier part of my book "the stress is laid too strongly on the thing-relation, and the paramount importance of the mental side of speech itself seems to be underestimated". It is not without piquancy to note that Professor Mathesius, referring to Funke's article, writes as follows: "Professor O. Funke's essay ... has ... the great merit of bringing the results of the respective investigation into harmony with the fundamental conceptions of modern linguistics, for in opposition to A. H. Gardiner, who overemphasizes the meaning, that is the conceptual or lexical as opposed to the contextual sense of the word belonging to language, the author clearly states that the function of naming, that is of putting words into relation to objective reality, belongs to speech, to the context of a sentence and to the concrete situation to which a sentence refers".<sup>10</sup> Since thus Funke considers that I overstress 'things' and Mathesius that I overstress the conceptual side, I am not without hope that I may in reality have done adequate justice to both. My actual intention was, however, to give prominence to 'things' rather than to the presentations of them, and this for several very good reasons. In the first place, it has long been my belief that, so far as it is legitimate and possible, linguistic theory ought to adopt, like every other science, the language and stand-points of every-day life, and ought to dispense with philosophic and psychological phraseology that the philologist without deep training in those recondite studies may only too easily misuse. We ought not to forget that the natural sciences are, though admittedly not to so great an extent, subject to the same psychological and ontological conditions as linguistic science. What should we think of the botanist who took elaborate precautions to say to his pupils: "Let us now examine the presentations which we believe, very possibly wrongly, to emanate from the materially existing flower which I imagine I am holding in my hand"?

<sup>10</sup> "On some problems of the systematic analysis of grammar" in *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague*, 6. I have ventured to rectify some obvious printers' errors.

Thus I hold that when dealing with those things which, on the common-sense plane, we accept without question as materially existent, linguistic theory ought to speak of 'things' quite shortly, and to leave out of account the unessential fact that we know them only by our presentations (*Vorstellungen*). On this point Funke is evidently in agreement. But I go further. Since it is evident that the *modus operandi* of speech is in all essentials the same whether we speak of material things or whether we speak of abstract matters, figments, and whole gists of sentences, I contend that it is useful, nay indeed essential for a clear exposition of linguistic theory, to regard all these likewise as 'things',<sup>11</sup> and the principal object of my § 8 was to show that this can be done without too great a departure from idiomatic English. The question resolves itself, accordingly, into one of terminological expediency, and Funke mistakes my purpose when he attributes to me a semi-mystical Platonic belief in the external existence of abstract nouns like 'religion' and 'enthusiasm'. It is true that I both have said and believe that these words designate 'things' independent of any one individual mind, for religion will obviously still continue to exist when I have personally been eliminated. But he ought not to attribute to me any more recondite doctrine than that. And before leaving this topic, I must point out a rather serious oversight on his part. He writes: "Whenever we speak or hear these words ('religion', 'enthusiasm') ... we discover that they refer to very complex spiritual 'modifications' or 'qualities' inherent in human souls as their bearers. That is to say, abstract nouns in general are expressions *in which substantival 'word-form' and 'word-function' are not congruent.*" The phrase which I have italicized once again employs terms borrowed from my book, and again, alas, employs them wrongly. In my book 'word-form' is a quality which words possess intrinsically as elements of language, and 'word-function' the role which words play when employed in actual speech. 'Incongruence' can thus only occur when speech is contrasted with language, e.g. when a word which language presents to us as an adjective is, in a given sentence, employed like a noun. In language word-form is and must be always congruent, i.e. it is as it is. The fact that 'religion' and 'enthusiasm' are given to us in language as substantival is proof positive that language regards the things signified by those words as 'things', and if language does so, why should linguistic theory do otherwise?

Had space permitted, I should have liked here to discuss other interesting topics raised by Funke's article, e.g. the question how far the function of naming is bound up with judgement, and the to my mind fallacious distinction between autosemantic and synsemantic words. But space does not permit,<sup>12</sup> and I must hasten on to consider Mathesius' contention that I have erred in describing the 'word' as the unit of 'language' and the 'sentence' as the unit of 'speech'.<sup>13</sup> The second half of this thesis is contradicted also by E. Hermann in a review of my book the cordiality of

<sup>11</sup> I have admitted, however, quite plainly that when word-form is in question we have to speak of words, not merely as referring to things, but as referring to them conceived or mentally entertained in a certain aspect. *Op. cit.*, pp. 142-3.

<sup>12</sup> I must, however, voice my regret that Funke should have quoted from the work of my great countryman Mill one of the rare passages in which he lapses from sound logic, viz. the sentence beginning "When I say 'the sun is the cause of day' ....."

<sup>13</sup> *Op. cit.*; and also in an article in *Slovo a Slovesnost*, vol. I (1935), pp. 42-6, which my friend and fellow-Egyptologist Dr. J. Černý has been kind enough to translate for me.

which gave me the greatest encouragement.<sup>14</sup> Against these scholars I will quote a passage from E. Winkler's brilliant review of Ries's book on the sentence, in which Winkler reaches the same conclusion as myself without knowledge of my book and also cites (at second-hand) a confirmatory judgement from de Saussure which I had overlooked:<sup>15</sup> "Jedenfalls ist der Begriff 'Satz' zunächst ein Begriff der 'Rede' (parole), nicht ein Begriff der 'Sprache' (langue). 'Die Grammatik', so schrieb vor kurzem auch Paul Kretschmer (*Glotta*, Bd. 19, S. 228), 'kann nur die Satztypen, die Satz schemata, die Prinzipien des Satzbaus behandeln. Die Satzschöpfung gehört ebensowenig wie die Wortschöpfung in ein System totter Symbole. Das war auch die Ansicht von F. de Saussure, der bei Erörterung der *Rapports syntagmatiques* im *Cours de linguistique* 172 sagt: La phrase est le type par excellence du syntagme. Mais elle appartient à la parole, non à la langue.'"

Still, no scientific question can be settled by the mere mustering of votes on the one side or other, so I will return to discussion. In the article written by Mathesius for his Czech readers he maintains that 'word' and 'sentence' each belong at once to 'language' and to 'speech', and that I, in assigning the first essentially to 'language' and the second essentially to 'speech', neglect an important aspect in each case, thereby vitiating the whole of my linguistic theory. What arguments does he advance in support of such a verdict? "Word and sentence are", he writes, "products of two different linguistic acts, the former a result of the naming act, the latter a result of the putting-in-relation act, but word as well as sentence belong to 'language' so far as their universality is concerned, and to 'speech' so far as their individuality is concerned. Gardiner errs in considering the word chiefly on the universal side". I must confess that these statements baffle me completely, firstly because I am unable to conceive of any deliberate act of naming which would not be a sentence, and secondly because in a passage already quoted (above, p. 61) Mathesius himself expressly defines "the function of naming" as "putting words into relation with objective reality".

The only further remark that Mathesius makes about words is not only difficult to link up with his previous statement, but also contains an unacceptable contention. "As regards the word", he says, "it must not be forgotten that in its concrete use in an utterance only part of its general meaning is actualized by the context and that this part is given a quite individual validity by the situation, inasmuch as a word forming a part of a concrete utterance is something quite different from a word as a sign forming part of a linguistic system". I cannot help thinking that the sense which seems to emerge from the last clause has somehow become distorted as a result of translation. Surely he cannot have meant that the words found in 'speech' have nothing in common with those found in 'language'. If that were really his meaning, then the words of 'language' would be left high and dry without explanation and without utility; they would, in fact, be absurdities. Surely there is some misunderstanding here, and perhaps Mathesius is alluding merely to the fact that an uttered word is necessarily in some respects different from one unuttered.<sup>16</sup> However this may be,

<sup>14</sup> *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1935, no. 12, pp. 514-7.

<sup>15</sup> E. Winkler, *Sprachtheoretische Studien*, pp. 62-3.

<sup>16</sup> The one being sounded and the other not. In addition, only the sound, and not the meaning, passes between speaker and listener. *Speech and Language*, p. 70, bottom.



the earlier part of his statement is exactly the kind of argument that I myself should have used to prove that the word, though employed *in* 'speech', is not of it, but of 'language', for it is only in considering a word outside any given sentence that we can realize its plenitude, the full range of its possible pronunciations<sup>17</sup> and the full area of its meaning; and since words cannot in general be further subdivided into smaller significant bits — some qualification will be necessary on this point — the 'word' is legitimately entitled to be called 'the unit of language'. The user of most words — not all, since proper names and abstracts are exceptions — is in the position of a man who wants to buy a sixpenny packet of cigarettes, but has only a shilling in his pocket. He hands over the shilling, but naturally does not expect the tobacconist to keep more than sixpence out of it. In a certain sense the shilling can be said to be *in* the bargain, but if one is asked what a shilling is, one remembers that there are plenty of other shillings about,<sup>18</sup> and replies that a shilling is a coin worth twelve pence belonging to the British currency.

To turn now to the 'sentence', the line of argument taken by Mathesius in his English article is as follows: "Does the sentence belong entirely to the transitory moment and is it as a linguistic entity entirely determined by the individual situation in which it is uttered? The answer to this question depends on whether or not we are willing to regard as a sentence any word or set of words followed by a pause and revealing an intelligible purpose. It can be imagined that a foreigner who does not know enough German would say on seeing a horse running *Pferd laufen* or that a patient nursed in a hospital for mental diseases would describe the action of the doctor writing a recipe with the words *Der Doktor — ein Rezept*. ... From the linguistic point of view, however, these sets of words are in my opinion no real sentences but only pathological sentence substitutes, for there is absent in them the outward form which the respective language has evolved for the construction of sentences." In answer to this I will freely admit that most philologists in the past would not have recognized *Pferd laufen* and *Der Doktor — ein Rezept* as sentences, but it is just in such cases and in the case of one-word sentences that, in my judgement, our habits of grammatical analysis need broadening. My verdict upon these utterances would have been that as sentences they are adequate, since they suffice to convey the speaker's communicative intention, but that as specimens of the German language they are both unidiomatic and formless. May I beg Professor Mathesius to read my §§ 29-30 once again. The heading of § 29 is "How language enters into speech", and this alone makes it obvious that I am guiltless of conceiving the sentence as entirely separate from and independent of 'language'. The real problem is: Since in any actual specific sentence speech-activity and language-science seem at first sight inextricably jumbled up together, is it possible to disentangle out of that sentence the elements and qualities which essentially belong to one or other of these two opposed domains? I think it is quite possible to perform this feat. To 'language' appertain the words used, the form of sentence employed, and also certain models of intonation there exemplified; to 'speech' must be

<sup>17</sup> The fact that words have their 'areas of pronunciation' as well as their 'areas of meaning' is a point to be dealt with by me in my second volume.

<sup>18</sup> More strictly 'other examples of the same coin'.

assigned the fact that the sentence embodies a communicative intention on the part of a particular person with regard to a particular state of affairs or matter in hand. In his subsequent statements Mathesius insists that a 'sentence' must necessarily have 'sentence-form', and that since 'sentence-form' belongs to 'language' — this is common ground between us — therefore a sentence must necessarily belong both to 'language' and to 'speech'. The conclusion is, however, a *non-sequitur*. I have admitted that 'language' enters into 'speech', but if we are to give the term 'sentence' any real utility at all in grammatical analysis it will be, not because it contains words, and not because it shows any given sentence-form, but because it displays a certain kind of purposiveness which is absent from any manifestation of 'language' when considered outside and apart from 'speech'. Mathesius labours to show that all sentences must display 'sentence-form', and I believe him to be right to the extent that every sentence must have a beginning and an end, though he does not mention this extreme exemplification of 'form'. But I doubt if he would accept that fact as constituting 'sentence-form', and furthermore if he did so, I should say, in scholastic parlance, that 'sentence-form' is an accident in sentences, and is not of their essence. Mathesius says that if I compared English and Czech I should see the importance of sentence-form. I do not doubt it, but he adduces no examples of one-word sentences with any sentence-form beyond the rather sophistic kind of 'sentence-form' I have just mentioned. My friend Dr. Černý tells me that the Czech can say '*Possibly!*' just as easily as the Englishman. It is precisely in such one-word sentences that the essential quality of a sentence can be best discerned. '*Possibly!*' when said in a given situation purposively in respect of a particular state of affairs is a sentence; when taken out of that situation and bereft of its purpose and relevance it is no longer a sentence. Accordingly I conclude that in its essence the sentence belongs to 'speech' and not to 'language'.

The objections raised by E. Hermann to my view of the sentence are practically identical with those of Mathesius, and as they are much more briefly expressed I need not reply specifically to them. In conclusion, I will express the hope that no phrase of mine has given the impression that I underestimate the importance of my opponents' views. He embarks on deep waters who embarks on linguistic theory, and it is very possible that there are several different ways in which one can learn to swim therein. I am only too conscious how often I myself have been in imminent danger of drowning.

London.

ALAN H. GARDINER.

## Notes and News

### Shakespeare's Contribution to R. Chester's "Love's Martyr"

#### The Phoenix and the Turtle

The rather unusual circumstances of the publication of *Love's Martyr* are well-known. As, however, they must be kept in mind if the true meaning of Shakespeare's little poem is to be grasped, I must be suffered to relate them once again.<sup>1</sup>

Among Shakespeare's friends in London there was a wealthy country gentleman, John Salisbury, who, leaving his Welsh estate, came to London with his family in 1595 and spent the greater part of the next ten years in the metropolis. His wealth, his birth and his marriage made it easy for him to mix in the most aristocratic society: he had royal blood in his veins, descending from an illegitimate son of King Henry VIII, and his wife was the illegitimate daughter of the Earl of Derby. He won the favour of the Queen, who made him one of her esquires and knighted him in 1601. Before settling in London, the worthy squire had been conspicuous in Wales as a patron of letters and a protector of local poets. In London he continued to show the deepest interest in literature, in the theatre in particular, and was soon the friend of the best-known playwrights of the day. In 1601, one of the poets he had encouraged in Wales determined to have a volume of his own verse published in London, in the hope thus to achieve the renown he thought he fully deserved. Chester — for that was the name of this pretentious person — collected all the verse he had been writing on all sorts of subjects for the last ten years, arranged it into what purposed to be a single composition, the avowed intent of which was to celebrate the marriage of Salisbury in 1587. This he naturally dedicated to his former Patron. Out of mere foolish vanity, or perhaps out of kindness, Salisbury not only accepted the dedication, but determined to do all he could to prevent the volume of his Welsh protégé sinking into immediate oblivion, as it plainly deserved to do. He appears to have called upon some of his literary friends in London, all well-known poets, begging them to honour the volume with poems of their own. This they agreed to do. But, instead of composing, according to custom, complimentary pieces on the author and his work, they all penned verses celebrating Sir John himself, their generous friend and patron, and penned them with their tongues in their cheeks. They had read enough of the Welshman's poem to discover how very absurd a production it was, how little it deserved the honour Sir John

<sup>1</sup> This note had been sent to *English Studies* and accepted some little time before Mr. B. H. Newdigate, whose edition of Jonson's Poems I had not yet seen, published in *The Times Literary Supplement* of Oct. 24, 1936 his article *The Phoenix and the Turtle. Was Lady Bedford the Phoenix?* in which he attempted to show that the couple alluded to in *Love's Martyr* was, not John Salisbury and his wife, but the Earl of Bedford and his wife, Lady Lucy, the well-known patroness of poets. I could not possibly examine Mr. Newdigate's view as I ought to without making another article of what must remain a brief footnote. So I must be content to say that I agree with Professor Short of Cornell (see his letter in T.L.S. of Feb. 13, 1937) in regarding Mr. Newdigate's reasons for his proposed identification as unconvincing. Nor does his answer to Professor Short (T.L.S. of Feb. 20) appear to better his case. However that may be, the interpretation of Shakespeare's contribution to the "diuerse poetically Essaies" which I offer here does not really depend on the question of the identification of the Phoenix.



wanted them to pay to it. But they resolved to humour him by pretending to celebrate his merits<sup>2</sup> while taking their own pleasure. He was sure to be mightily pleased at being celebrated by such eminent poets, and his vanity or his obtuseness would keep him from seeing that he was being made a fool of.

Chester had sung the marriage of his patron under an allegorical disguise: a turtle — the turtle of course typifies constancy in love — impersonated Salisbury and a phoenix — symbol of love and beauty — stood for his wife. Their marriage was most strangely represented by the death of the phoenix: married life, this I imagine was Chester's sensible but rather unflattering meaning, effectively destroys a woman's beauty. Out of the ashes of the wonderful bird, however, there rises a new phoenix, as beautiful as her mother was; which was meant as a compliment to Sir John's daughter, a girl of fourteen in 1601 ... After Chester's long rambling poem, the reader of *Love's Martyr* comes on a new title-page: *Hereafter follow diuerse poeticall Essaies on the former subject, viz. the Turtle and Phoenix. Done by the best and chieftest of our modern writers, with their names subscribed to their particular works: never before extant: And now first consecrated by them all generally to the love and merit of the true-noble Knight, Sir John Salisburie. Dignum laude virum Musa vetat mori. MDCI.* In which title-page, I need hardly point out, the mocking intent is evident. All the poems that follow, by Shakespeare, Marston, Chapman, Jonson and another poet who signs 'Ignoto', refer, in accordance with the title, to the subject of the Turtle and the Phoenix: to their marriage, that is to the death of the Phoenix, to their constancy in love, and to their reward in a new little phoenix their daughter.

Shakespeare, possibly because he was the foremost poet of the group, was entrusted with the task of celebrating the death of the Phoenix. Chapman undertook to praise the constancy of the Turtle, Sir John. Jonson, besides expatiating on the same theme, added the necessary explanation in the form of an encomium on the Phoenix and her 'illustrate brightness'

O, so divine a creature,  
Who could be false to ?

Lastly Marston sang the perfections of the new phoenix, Sir John's young daughter. They all wrote in a spirit of rollicking fun, apparently enjoying the joke to the full. But prudently — they did not want to hurt their devoted friend — they concealed their mockery under a pretence of high seriousness calculated to lead him astray. In this they were so successful that they have led astray not Sir John alone, but all the critics so far as I know. The amount of nonsense which has been written and published on their little sequence, and on Shakespeare's contribution in particular, is really staggering.

As a matter of fact, Shakespeare's poem is not difficult to understand, provided one sees the joke. "These are 'country matters'; from which, thank Heaven, we are never far away in Shakespeare", as Middleton Murry

<sup>2</sup> No mercenary hope did bring them forth,  
They tread not in that servile gate,  
But a true zeal, born in our spirits,  
Responsible to your high merits ...

says.<sup>3</sup> And if the reader is afraid of being shocked, let him stop here. The joke is indelicate. But I'll do what I can to explain it delicately.

Chester had allegorized the marriage of Salisbury and his wife as the death of the Phoenix. This absurd idea tickled Shakespeare's fancy who, in view I suppose of the Turtle's constancy, would not have it that the Phoenix died alone; the Turtle must die with her; they both must die together. This being settled, he determined to celebrate their death, that is the marriage, by means of a funeral song. So, remembering a famous nursery rhyme, the poet calls on different birds to attend the funeral in various capacities suited to their character or plumage: the nightingale will act as 'herald sad', the eagle will be present to see to it that everything is done as it should be, to keep 'the obsequy so strict', the swan will be the 'priest in surplice white', and the crow one of the mourners. When all the birds have assembled, an anthem is sung, the purpose of which is to explain the circumstances of the 'tragic scene' of the two lovers' death: at the very moment when their love was to be consummated, when, as the poet says, from two they were growing to one, and

no space was seen  
'Twixt the turtle and his queen,

when reason was being puzzled how two could be one though remaining two, they were both and together consumed in the mutual flame of their love... To complete the obsequies, there only remains to sing the threnody or funeral lamentation. And here Shakespeare's own explanation of what was to be understood by the lovers' death comes out quite plainly, and his motive is apparent: he wishes to make fun of Chester's preposterous idea of representing Sir John's daughter as rising out of the ashes of her dead mother. So her birth was a miracle! Poor Sir John had nothing to do with it! Very well! He and his bride must be made to die then before anything has happened:

Death is now the phoenix' nest;  
And the turtle's loyal breast  
To eternity doth rest,

Leaving no posterity;  
'Twas not their infirmity,  
It was married chastity.

Thus, Shakespeare's contribution to the second part of Chester's volume was a joke, and one which was not in the best of tastes. But the creator of Juliet's Nurse was not over-delicate. Like most men, like all full-blooded young men at any rate, Shakespeare had a particular relish for what is called obscene jests. Not to admit it, would be absurd. Here the grossness is carefully concealed, but so it is in many of Mercutio's, or Hamlet's jokes. And just as most editors either do not see or pretend not to see the worst kind of indecencies in the plays, so critics have not realized or pretend not to have grasped the true signification of this little piece of verse.

Salisbury himself does not appear to have resented it. We must therefore assume that either he did not see the joke, or that, if he did, he was sensible enough to pretend he did not. Until his death ten years later, he remained

<sup>3</sup> Shakespeare, p. 89.

on excellent terms with poets and players. And his active interest in the drama became a sort of tradition in his family for several generations. His son and his grandson have left proofs of their attachment to the memory of Shakespeare. His son, on the publication of the first collected edition of Shakespeare's plays in 1623, addressed a few lines of congratulation — which did not come to light until 1922 — to Heminges and Condell for the 'undaunted pains' they had taken in the difficult task, — difficult, for all it had been a labour of love, — of 'raising from the womb of earth a richer mine' than those the Spaniards had discovered in America. His grandson wrote plays, still unprinted, which are said to be full of Shakespearean reminiscences.

P.S. When I wrote the above note I was not aware that my suspicions that 'The Phoenix and the Turtle' was not to be taken seriously had been anticipated. But Professor Lüdeke kindly drew my attention to Mr. C. Knox Pooler's query on p. xcii of his Introduction to *Shakespeare's Poems* (Arden Shakespeare): "... were Shakespeare and his fellows expected to write the usual complimentary verses as an introduction to Chester's poem and did they, after consultation, decide to save their credit by substituting independent studies of Love and Constancy?" a query which may be construed as implying suspicions similar to mine.

Lausanne.

G. BONNARD.

### Voicing of Spirants in English

A paper by Professor B. Trnka "On the phonological development of spirants in English", printed in the *Proceedings of the Second Congress of Phonetic Sciences* (Cambridge 1936), p. 60 ff., is directed against an old pet theory of mine, according to which we find in English a pretty close, though not perfect, parallel to Verner's famous law for Pre-Germanic. Trnka thinks that my theory "perhaps cannot be disproved from the phonetic point of view, but if we try to verify it in the light of the phonological development of spirants in English, it appears to be rather improbable ... it is entirely different from Verner's Law". Now I for one fail to see that the contrast between phonetic and phonological points of view is such that an explanation of a sound change can be probable from one and improbable from the other, and I say this with due deference to much of the work of the recent phonological school.

Unfortunately Trnka does not know the latest and fullest treatment of my theory, in *Linguistica* (Copenhagen, 1933, p. 346-383; in the paper "Verners gesetz und das wesen des akzents", ib. p. 228 ff., I deal with other real or supposed parallels to Verner's law). But even in my previous treatments of the subject Trnka might have found scores of instances not mentioned by him that speak in favour of my theory as well as a conscientious enumeration of seeming or real exceptions to my rule. I shall now take some of the disputed points in the order in which they occur in Trnka's paper.



"The voiceless spirant *f* did not change into *ʒ* as might be expected from the supposed change of *tf* into *dʒ*". I accounted for the retention of [*f*] in *finish*, *parish*, *English*, etc. by saying (p. 372) that this is evidently connected with the fact that at the time when the voicing took place in the other instances, the voiced sound corresponding to [*f*], namely [*ʒ*], was not found as an independent phoneme in the language, but existed only in the group [*dʒ*]. ([*ʒ*] developed later in *vision*, *leisure*, etc.) Here, thus, my reasoning is purely "phonological". Nevertheless, as I point out, [*f*] in a few cases became voiced, but then as [*dʒ*]. — With regard to what Trnka is pleased to call "the supposed change of *tf* into *dʒ*" — though few things are more certain in the history of English sounds than the change in *knowleche* > *knowledge*, *Greenwich*, *ajar*, etc., — he remarks on the following page that it "may be omitted in our discussion because it is most improbable that it should have been due to the same cause as that of the other spirants" — an easy way of getting rid of inconvenient facts.<sup>1</sup>

According to Trnka "no change really took place in such words as *exist*" and the others with *ex*, where the voiced pronunciation was "undoubtedly adopted from that of Old French", which thus is taken to be identical with the modern French sound. Now, the old Latin sounds in *ex-* were, of course, voiceless, and in popular words we have Fr. *ss*: *essai*, *essaim*, OF *eissir*. In literary words with *ex-* the Fr. pronunciation had [*ks*] up till the 16th century, and [*gz*] does not seem to have prevailed till the 17th c., see Charles Thurot, *La Pron. Fr. d'après le témoignage des grammairiens*, II, 337 f. Vaugelas in 1647 still knows *exemple* with [*ks*] in "plusieurs à la cour". In *execute*, etc., where English has now [*ks*] after a stressed vowel, the change according to Trnka was "just the reverse of that supposed" by me. But why, how, and when this unvoicing took place, is not explained by T.; an influence from *x* in ME *axen*, etc. (p. 62) would presuppose too much phonetic consciousness in ordinary speakers. Not a word is said of the voiced sounds in *Alexander*, *anxiety*, *luxurious*, strong witnesses in favour of my view.

With regard to the prefixes *dis-*, *trans-* and *re-* T. similarly holds that the voiced sound was simply the OFr. pronunciation of *s* between vowels; but unfortunately for him he includes among his own examples *discern* and *design*, which have Fr. [*s*]; he does not mention *dessert*, *resemble*, *resent* or *possess* — all of them with Fr. [*s*] and E. [*z*] before the stress.

With regard to *of*, *with*, as Trnka says that after the "phonologization of the voiced spirants" — what is meant is, after these had become full phonemes that could be found initially and finally, and not only, as in OE, in medial position<sup>2</sup> — such words had a double pronunciation according to the sound following, and that then the voiced sound was generalized. He adduces no evidence for his supposition. But I am happily able to support him on this one point through Hart's sandhi-rules which I unearthed thirty years ago, see *John Hart's Pronunciation of English (1569 and 1570)*, p. 14

<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless T. mentions *which* as an exception to my rule, though, as a matter of fact, it confirms it, as the word is used much more frequently in a stressed position than unstressed and thus preserves the unvoiced sound.

<sup>2</sup> I deal with this development in my British Acad. paper, reprinted in *Linguistica*, p. 373, and ascribe it to four factors, (1) French loans, (2) loans from the Southern dialects, (3) the loss of weak *e*, and (4) my "law". Of these Trnka mentions (1) and (3) only.

ff. and the word-lists, p. 112 ff. for *ð*, *þ*, *z*, *s*. But even then Trnka's simple formula and his half-hearted concession to my view when he speaks of "words which often had a proclitic position" do not explain all the facts. It is only when we recognize fully the influence of stress that we see why in some cases the voiced, in others the voiceless sound prevailed: *of off*, *wið herewiþ*, as also.

[f] became [v] not only in *of*, but also in the obsolete forms of some compounds of *-wife*: *hussive*, *goodive*, which Trnka does not mention. The transition [s > z] in numerous inflexional endings is perfectly easy and simple if you accept my view, but if you do not its explanation requires not a little ingenuity. In Trnka's view "it is probably due to the tendency of the language to conform the verbal ending of the present tense *-s*, *-z*, *-is* [he means *-iz*] wholly to that of the weak preterite *-t*, *-d*, *-id*, cf. *laughs* : *laughed*, *loves* : *loved*, but: *wanted* : *faces*." Are we really to imagine ordinary people in the fifteenth century to have had a feeling (conscious or unconscious) of the tripartition in *laughed*, *loved*, *wanted* (not noticed by grammarians till the latter half of the nineteenth century, I think) and then to have accomplished conformity by changing their pronunciation of the third person singular *loves* from [s] to [z] and *faces* from [is] to [iz], even though the conditions (patent to a trained phonetician) do not appear to be the same: in one case [id] after a dental stop, in the other [iz] after a hiss [s, z, ʃ, ʒ] — I ask, is this psychologically probable?

Nor is this all, for according to Trnka they even changed the endings in innumerable plurals and genitives of substantives, *kings*, *king's*, *kings'*, *princes*, *prince's*, *princes'*, *hills*, *churches*, *bridges*, etc., so as to bring about a perfectly parallel tripartition in all these inflexional endings, "because they [substantives?] were felt to be perfectly homophonous with that [what?] of the verb".

The whole construction seems to me utterly unbelievable: at any rate I do not call to mind a single analogy-formation in any language that could be approximately compared with it.

Trnka closes with an interpretation of Verner's Law for Old Germanic which would certainly have baffled its originator: "the neutralization of the voice correlation of spirants before unstressed vowels", and finally parallels this with the Danish falling together of *p* and *b* in *slæbe*, *oppe*. *Explique cela qui pourra*.

Lundehave, Helsingør.

OTTO JESPERSEN.

**Anglo-Norman Text Society.** A committee has been formed under the chairmanship of Sir William Craigie to encourage the study of Anglo-Norman and more particularly to promote the publication of Anglo-Norman Texts. Further information may be obtained from the Secretary, Professor M. K. Pope, the University, Manchester, 13.

**A New History of English Literature.** The publication is announced of a *Geschichte der Englischen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* by Walter F. Schirmer, Professor of English Literature in the University of Berlin, author of *Antike, Renaissance und Puritanismus*, *Der Englische Roman der Neuesten Zeit*, *Der Englische Frühhumanismus*, and other works. The new History will appear in ten monthly instalments of eighty pages each, price per instalment RM. 2.—., the first part to appear in April. It is to be published by Max Niemeyer Verlag, Halle/Saale, Germany.

---

## Reviews

*The Works of Edmund Spenser.* A Variorum Edition. Edited by E. GREENLAW, C. G. OSGOOD and F. M. PADEFORD. Vol. III: *The Faerie Queene*, Book Three. F. M. PADEFORD, Special Editor. ix + 432 pp. Vol. IV: *The F. Q.* Book Four. RAY HEFFNER, Special Editor. xi + 357 pp. Vol. V: *The F. Q.* Book Five. RAY HEFFNER, Special Editor. xi + 375 pp. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1934-35-36. Price \$6.00 per volume. (Not sold separately.)

*The Axiochus of Plato.* Translated by EDMUND SPENSER. Edited by F. M. PADEFORD. ix + 80 pp. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1934. \$2.75.

*Studies in Spenser's Complaints.* By H. STEIN. xii + 196 pp. New York: Oxford University Press. 1934. \$2.50.

*Spenser's Theory of Friendship.* By C. G. SMITH. viii + 74 pp. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1936. \$1.25.

*Two Centuries of Spenserian Scholarship (1609—1805).* By J. WURTSBAUGH. ix + 174 pp. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1936. \$2.25.

When in a review in this journal (June 1934) I called attention to the renewed and ever increasing interest taken in Spenser, I added that the signs of this brisk revival were especially noticeable in America. Since then America has undoubtedly taken the lead in Spenser studies, which may be partly attributed to the impetus given by that truly great scholar, the late professor Greenlaw. His influence continues to be felt. Time and again we find the indebtedness to his stimulating example acknowledged, and in the books under review his name is again in evidence. To him also the honour is due of first conceiving the idea of the invaluable Variorum Edition now in course of publication. In the new volumes the editors have of course stuck to the same plan as was adopted for the first two, and I may therefore refer the reader to my review of these in the June number of 1934.



Everything I said there about the excellent get-up, and about the splendid scholarship evinced in the first volumes holds good for these further instalments. When I wrote the first review I had only been able to dip into the notes here and there, but I have since used the books regularly and this closer acquaintance has fully confirmed my provisional opinion. I have found that the 'Commentary', in which quotations from the work of a multitude of critics and scholars are collected, is even more comprehensive than I had at first thought. And the editors have not limited their attention to books and articles exclusively devoted to Spenser; books of a more general character also lie within their purview, a wise policy, as such works sometimes contain observations of great value. I am thinking here more particularly of professor Grierson's excellent *Cross Currents in English Literature of the 17th Century* in which he has made so many original and penetrating remarks on Spenser. Among the 'Appendices' of the new volumes, which deal with various subjects: Sources and Analogues, The Historical Allegory, The Date of Composition, The Virtue of Friendship etc., those on The Italian Romances and Spenser's Use of the Plastic Arts are particularly interesting. The 'Bibliographies' tend to become shorter as the great work proceeds, because titles given before are of course not repeated in subsequent volumes. It would, however, be convenient to have also a list of all the titles together, and I trust the editors will publish a complete bibliography at the end of the last volume.

In catalogues of the 18th century and in some early editions of Spenser's works mention is made of a translation of the *Axiochus* — a dialogue attributed to Plato. It seemed impossible, however, to decide the question whether Spenser did indeed, as tradition had it, translate this short work so extremely popular in England in the 16th century. It remained a moot point and at any rate the translation, if it had existed, seemed to be irretrievably lost. In 1931, however, W. Heffer and Sons offered for sale a copy of the 1679 folio edition of Spenser's Works, with an accompanying note as follows: "At the end is a 12mo edition of *Axiochus*, a Dialogue of Plato, translated by Edw. (sic) Spenser London, printed for Cuthbert Burbie 1592. This has been taken to pieces and each leaf inlaid to folio size." Professor Padelford had the good fortune to secure this volume and he has now made the translation available to the public. He has thereby put all students of Spenser under his obligation, not only because anything, however slight, added to the work of a great author cannot but be welcome, but because this particular piece is by no means devoid of merit and intrinsic value. It is indeed, as the editor says, more than a translation: "The version is so amplified and embellished that at times it amounts almost to a paraphrase; it has become a prose poem of beauty and feeling, rapid, imaginative and musical." After a careful comparison of eleven Latin, French and Italian translations previous to Spenser's version, he has come to the conclusion that Spenser used the edition of Welsdalius, which gives the Greek text and a Latin translation in parallel columns. He therefore prints this text in facsimile at the end of his book, which also contains an interesting Introduction and some textual Notes.

Mr. Stein's book on Spenser's *Complaints* makes a somewhat rambling, incoherent impression, but this is chiefly due to the subject treated, the

*Complaints* volume containing a heterogeneous collection of poems and translations. It is a volume too which presents quite a number of problems to the student of Spenser. The date of almost every separate poem in it is uncertain; it is possible that some pieces had circulated in manuscript long before publication; it is probable that several were substantially revised by the poet; some of the allegorical passages are very obscure. And there are still other questions to be dealt with, as e.g. the dating of the three plays *Lochrine*, *Selimus* and *Alphonsus*, the authors of which borrow extensively from the *Complaints*. All these problems have already often been dealt with and Mr. Stein gives a useful survey of the work that has been done. He differs in opinion from his predecessors chiefly in the dating of the principal poems, which he assigns to a later period than the one to which they are generally assumed to belong. It seems to me that he makes out quite a good case, but not having made a special study of the very complicated problem of the chronology of these works, I must confess myself incompetent to pronounce a definite opinion. But besides the highly controversial subject of the dating, several other topics are dealt with. A very interesting essay is the one on *Mother Hubbard's Tale*, and I have found the last two chapters of the book: The Visions of Petrarch, and of Bellay, with the comparisons between early and later lines and passages, very helpful and elucidating. A very full Bibliographical Appendix, giving collations, variants, books cited etc., enhances the value of the book, which is illustrated by reproductions of five title-pages.

Very much has already been written about the Renaissance conception of friendship and on that of Spenser in particular, and Mr. Smith's book can hardly be said to break much new ground. Nor do the conclusions at which he arrives deviate much, if at all, from accepted opinion. But he alleges new proofs for them, and gives apt quotations from a host of writers in support of his opinions. The best and longest essay in the volume is that on the Fourth Book of the *Fairy Queen*. The author shows that the antithesis on which it is based is strikingly parallel to the conflict in *Mutability*, and he cleverly defends and develops Mr. Notcut's thesis that this Book is not, as many critics have held, formless. The other essays deal with Spenser's theory of friendship; an Elizabethan commonplace; The Ethical Allegory of the Two Florimels — an interesting interpretation —, and Ideas about Friendship in Spenser and Alain, showing that the latter's *Complaint of Nature* has elements in common with the Fourth Book of the *Fairy Queen*.

It was to be expected that the revival of the interest in Spenser would sooner or later lead to the publication of a work like the well-known surveys of Chaucer and Shakespeare criticism. Mr. Wurtsbaugh has now supplied us with such a volume. Though it gives evidence of the most painstaking research, it is very much smaller in bulk than its prototypes. This is partly attributable to the comparatively scant attention paid to Spenser in the past. Moreover the author has restricted himself to the 17th and 18th centuries, the 1805 Variorum edition being the last work that receives consideration. There is no objection to this, seeing that he promises us a second volume, which is to continue the tale up to the present. But I think it strange that he has ignored the very first commentary on

Spenser, the well-known notes by the mysterious E. K. For these are particularly interesting and typical of the period and the reason given for ignoring them, viz. that "E. K. annotated Spenser's first work rather than his last and his opinions could therefore hardly be definitive", does not seem to me a cogent, or even a clearly comprehensible one. But apart from this omission the volume deserves praise. The author has done his work thoroughly, he writes well and brings out the salient points; and though it is true — as the author modestly admits himself — that he had largely to deal with matter of little, if any intrinsic value, there are also very interesting pages, notably those on Warton. And the book is useful, because it gives a good survey of Spenserian research and therefore "in miniature a history of scholarship at large".

Amsterdam.

A. G. VAN KRANENDONK.

*The Life and Work of Henry Chettle.* By HAROLD JENKINS.  
VI + 276 pp. London: Sidgwick and Jackson. 1934. 12s. 6d.

Hitherto Henry Chettle has occupied a modest place in English literary history. Of the many dramas he wrote single-handed only one tragedy — *Hoffman* — has survived and that one in a wretchedly corrupt state. *Patient Grissell*, *The Blind Beggar of Bethnal Green*, *The Downfall and Death of Robert Earl of Huntingdon* were written by him in collaboration with others and brought in the miserable pittance paid by Philip Henslowe, that astute theatre-manager, to enable his hacks to keep body and soul together. Of Chettle's career very little is known, even the dates of his birth and death are matters of conjecture. We owe some biographical facts to the Stationers' Register from which we learn that on the eighth day of October 1577 "Henrie Chettell sonne of Robert Chettell late of London, Dier Deceased hath put himself apprentice to Thomas East, Cytezen and Stacioner of London for seven yeres begynninge at Michelmas laste paste." Seven years later we find the following entry under 6th October 1584: "Thomas East. Henry Chettell Sworne and Admitted A freman of this company." In 1587 he appears to have been sent to Cambridge in connection with the business of the company, as witness the cash abstract: "10 July 1587 Paid to Henry Chettle to beare his charges to Cambridge about the Companyes affaires VI s." By the Court of Assistants (3 Aug. 1591) "Yt is thought good that Wm. Hoskins maye accept to be partners with him in printinge Hen. Chettle and John Danter: providing alwayes that there shalbe no alienac'on, or transporting made by him to them, or either of them, or to any other, of his Rowm or place of a mayster printer, without the consent of the Master, Wardens and Assistants for the tyme beinge."<sup>1</sup> In the same year the three partners printed a sermon by the Rev. Henry Smith bearing their names in the colophon.<sup>1</sup> The next year saw the publication "uppon the perill of Henrye Chettle" of (Robert) *Greenes Groatsworth of Witte, Bought with a Million of Repentance*. This pamphlet, containing the supposed attack on Shakespeare, seems in some quarters to have been fathered on Chettle,

<sup>1</sup> Joseph Ames: *Typographical Antiquities* II, 1113.



which led the latter to repudiate its authorship in the epistle to the readers prefixed to his next venture, *Kinde Hartes Dreame*, a series of satires on current abuses, more in the manner of Stubbes than in that of Greene. That Chettle was intimately acquainted with the tricks which Stubbes and Greene described so graphically in their pamphlets is abundantly clear from this production. It seems as if Chettle felt somewhat doubtful of the reception of his work, judging from the extreme diffidence with which he presented it. But for the general assumption that he or Nash had written the abusive allusions to "the upstart Crow" in *Greenes Groatsworth*, *Kinde Hartes Dreame* would have come out anonymously, as witness also his note to the reader appended to his *England's Mourning Garment* (1603): "I love as little as any man to come in print". The romance — or should we call it a tract? — *Piers Plainnes Seven Yeres Prentiship*, a cross between the pastoral and the picaresque genre, was also published anonymously, the only external clue to the name of the author being the initials H. L. The work was not entered in the Stationers' Register; the reason for non-entry may have been the consideration on the part of the publisher that the book would probably not reach a second edition and that consequently it would be a waste of money to secure the copyright. It seems, indeed, to have attracted little notice, if we except a brief mention in the preface to Emanuel Ford's *Montelion*, and no reprint has ever been issued. Yet it possesses its own peculiar interest by reason of the two lyrics to be found in it. In *The Times Literary Supplement* of October 1, 1931, Professor Hyder E. Rollins called attention to the circumstance till then overlooked, that the song beginning: "Feede on my Flocks securely" occurring in *England's Helicon* over the signature H. C. appears also in *Pierce Plainnes Seaven Yeres Prentiship* and inferred that Chettle was the author of the other H. C. poems in that anthology, which had generally been attributed to Henry Constable. This of course presupposes, as Mr. Jenkins is careful to point out, that Henry Chettle was in fact the author of *Piers Plainnes*. The identification of H. C., the author of *Piers Plainnes*, with Henry Chettle, the obscure hack, would naturally raise considerably the latter's status as a lyrical poet, and it speaks well for Mr. Jenkins's critical method that, though decidedly leaning to the view that Chettle was the author, he does not, in summing up the pros and cons, dismiss the alternative possibility of Henry Constable having written the picaresque story. The same cautious manner characterizes the whole of the monograph and it is surely not detracting from the merits of this scholarly work to point out a slight error on page 40, where the statement is made that of the two ballads *The Carman's Whistle* and *Watkin's Ale*, both mentioned in *Kinde Hartes Dreame*, only the latter has survived. *The Carman's Whistle* has been preserved in MS. Rawlinson Bodleian Library No. 14677 and was printed as early as 1905 in *Herrig's Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*. Another point that seems to have escaped Mr. Jenkins: Is it likely that Henry Constable, who was a B. A. of Cambridge, should have committed the blunder on folio 22 of *Piers Plainnes*: 'Male partae male dilabuntur'? But of course this may have been a mere printer's error.

Altogether, Mr. Jenkins's book impresses me as a very judicious and sensible study, free from extravagances and fads.

*Pope's Own Miscellany.* Being a reprint of Poems on Several Occasions 1717 containing new poems by Alexander Pope and others. Edited by NORMAN AULT. xcvii + 165 pp. London: The Nonesuch Press. 1935. Edition limited to 750 copies. 22/6.

*The Early Career of Alexander Pope.* By GEORGE SHERBURN. viii + 326 pp., 5 plates. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1934. 15/— net.

*L'Influence française dans l'Œuvre de Pope.* Par EMILE AUDRA. vi + 650 pp. Paris: Champion, 1931. 75 frs.

A new tendency in the appreciation of Pope sets in with Edith Sitwell's passionate vindication of the poet's character in 1930. Miss Sitwell based her defence on no new data (some of her quotations are second-hand and inaccurate, as can be seen by collating the passage from Dennis's *Reflections*, given at p. 74, with the corresponding text in Sherburn, p. 92), but on an instinctive reaction of her womanly nature against the bullies who harassed a crippled hunchback. "Poor little creature" — she is heard exclaiming, — "While he was still in petticoats, he was attacked by 'a wild cow', who knocked him down, trampled on him, and wounded him in the throat with her horns ..." This horrified outcry is typical of Miss Sitwell's attitude throughout her book; she cannot dismiss from before her eyes the vision of the child trampled by the wild cow, or of the warm-hearted youth whose system is poisoned by the bite of that tarantula, Dennis. The two visions become one, and Miss Sitwell expresses herself in a way which comes dangerously near to the maudlin ejaculations of spinsters advocating prevention of cruelty to "our dumb friends". "The black poison which had been instilled into Pope's system," — she writes, — "was slow in working into each warm vein of the heart; at first he was stunned and bewildered by the pain, lying quite quietly beneath it as he had lain quietly on the heap of stones with which he had been playing when he was a little child of three years old, and a huge and unreasoning beast had knocked him down and injured him. At moments he seemed half numbed, though he was outwardly the same youth that he had been, etc."<sup>1</sup> Very appropriately, then, the greenish cover of Miss Sitwell's book shows her willowy length almost enfolding the poet's laureate bust; but, for all her taking under her wing the "poor little creature", Miss Sitwell has helped more than anybody else, through her impassioned biography and her authoritative judgement of Pope's verse, to bring back to him sympathetic, and even enthusiastic, readers. After the Donne "wave", we have had a Pope "wave": the standards set by the romantic critics of the last century have suffered another blow. True, in less biassed minds than those of academic critics (who, slow in admitting the romantics to Parnassus, are, naturally enough, slow in taking them down from the altars to which they exalted them so grudgingly and so late), Pope may be shown to have always enjoyed a

<sup>1</sup> The effect is positively grotesque when on p. 192 Miss Sitwell gives us a picture of the poet sitting alone in his grotto (of which she has just written an exquisite description): "Sometimes, but very rarely, the poet sat alone among the glittering stones of his grotto. What was he thinking about, sitting there, so quietly? Of that heap of stones into which he was thrown by the wild cow, when she attacked him so wantonly? Of John Dennis? etc."

steady reputation, from Sainte-Beuve, who, defending him against that high priest of Corybantic professors, Taine, in 1864, gave him a place of honour among the "poètes modérés, cultivés, et polis", down to André Gide who wrote in the pages of his *Journal* for 1930 (published in *La Nouvelle Revue Française*, Juin 1932, p. 994): "Je lis *l'Épître d'Héloïse à Abélard* de Pope, avec l'admiration la plus vive. Ma considération pour Pope n'a fait que croître à mesure que je le connaissais davantage; et pourquoi n'avouerai-je pas que cette poésie chargée de signification me touche plus que les flottantes ejaculations d'un Shelley, par exemple, qui me force, pour planer avec lui, à abandonner insatisfaite une trop importante partie de moi-même." But it is only too natural that Pope should appeal to the French, since he owes so much to French literature, as was well known even before M. Audra, in his excellent dissertation, had shown that that debt was much more extensive than one thought.

That defence of Pope which Miss Sitwell had undertaken in a brilliant, if amateurish, fashion, Mr. Sherburn has grounded on carefully collected and sifted evidence. Impressive as a legal document, Mr. Sherburn's book suffers by contrast with Miss Sitwell's: it lacks too much those qualities of colour, of narrative felicity, which make Miss Sitwell's defence so readable. Of course Mr. Sherburn's work follows a very different method, but one cannot help feeling that it has suffered greatly from the fact that its preparation "has intermittently occupied the author's time for a shocking number of years." Even a card-index gets tired by waiting. While Miss Sitwell did not hesitate to draw conclusions without much bothering about the imperfect state of her sources, Mr. Sherburn, in consideration of the lack of a critical text of Pope's poems, and worse still, of his letters, says that this is no time to talk of definitive lives of the poet; therefore his book "has practically nothing in common with the aims of that admirable *genre* of French critical writing, titles of which frequently begin *La jeunesse de ...* In other words, only remotely and partially, if at all, does this volume analyse the formation of Pope's genius in terms of his reading or aesthetic theory. It does seek to show the influence of his environment on the direction of his genius towards satire. It is at sharp issue with a conception of Pope as a solitary whose days were passed 'in the contemplation of his own greatness' and in the concoction of new schemes to blacken worthy rivals." The gist of Mr. Sherburn's investigations is in the following sentences: "His success, his brilliance in caustic utterance, his religion, and his political activities all brought attack. His energy led him to retorts; he presently acquired the notion that he was being persecuted, and hence probably he justified his deviations from honesty, which are much less serious than our morally expert but bibliographically untrained grandparents used to imagine." A wide reading in the quarrel literature of Pope's day might have inspired with a new *Dunciad* a more imaginative critic than Mr. Sherburn, who makes a point of being factual, even "ploddingly factual"; and "the multiplicity and complexity of the facts are such that quite possibly no ventilation will be apparent." If Mr. Sherburn's book is not a history of the early career of Pope, it is however an invaluable chronicle, or *catalogue raisonné* of facts; it supplies material with a view to an appreciation of the influence of Pope's environment on the direction of his genius towards satire; but it leaves the reader completely in the dark as to the nature of satire: "There has been a general assumption through



the last 'romantic' century that the genesis of satire is ill nature, but this hardly seems a sound view. At any rate ..." Another important point on which Mr. Sherburn fails to throw light, concerns Pope's intimacy with Martha Blount; it may well be that "whether she was Pope's mistress is now nobody's business", but then we have nothing with which to qualify the statement made elsewhere by Mr. Sherburn (p. 203): "His contemptible physique made any admiration of women on his part practically futile so far as love was concerned, and made him feel keenly such frustration of that passion as he depicts" in the *Verses to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady and Eloisa to Abelard*. Pope's life, like Swift's, can be written either externally, or conjecturally; in neither case satisfactorily. There is perhaps one sole episode in Pope's life which stands out clearly: his passion for his villa at Twickenham, the ingenuity — worthy of such a decadent as Huysmans's *Des Esseintes* — he displayed in decorating his grotto. Apropos of this Dr. Johnson wrote a sentence whose import might easily be made to extend beyond the particular case: "Pope's excavation was requisite as an entrance to his garden, and, as some men try to be proud of their defects, he extracted an ornament from an inconvenience, and vanity produced a grotto where necessity enforced a passage." Pope's genius for mystification and satire might be explained on such lines. "When you shut the doors of this grotto it becomes on the instant, from a luminous room, a *Camera obscura*, on the walls of which all the objects of the river, hills, woods, and boats, are forming a moving picture in their visible radiations; and when you have a mind to light it up, it affords you a very different scene. It is finished with shells interspersed with pieces of looking-glass in angular forms; and in the ceiling is a star of the same material, at which when a lamp, of an orbicular figure of thin alabaster, is hung in the middle, a thousand pointed rays glitter, and are reflected over the place." Possibly this passage is more illuminating than the piles of contemporary newspapers the reading of which has taken Mr. Sherburn "a shocking number of years". But if it is risky to write a life conjecturally, it seems utterly unsound to write it emblematically. Thus, let us be content with external facts, without pretending that their assemblage should form a life, for, can these bones live?

Also Mr. Norman Ault distrusts the psychological method. After having improved on a discovery of Prof. Case concerning the miscellany entitled *Poems on Several Occasions* (London, Lintot, 1717,) by ascribing to Pope, both on bibliographical and biographical grounds, the majority of the forty-two unsigned pieces contained in that collection, he comes to the question of motive, on which the reader, *faute de mieux* (for the poems themselves are slight, and would hardly justify Mr. Ault's expense of ingenuity in tracing their author), may concentrate his interest: "The question of motive, which at every stage of the story has been growing more insistent, can no longer be postponed. Why — why did Pope surround his connexion with *Poems on Several Occasions* with such a cloud of mystery and dissimulation? In such a quest as this the poet himself would say: 'Search then the Ruling Passion ... This clue once found, unravels all the rest;' while, on the other hand, psychologists would say — but what wouldn't they say? The present writer may perhaps be forgiven if he thinks Pope's method as much too simple, as that of modern psychology too tortuous, for the purposes of this introduction. As he visualizes the problem, there can be discerned

at work in the poet's mind many different motives — as diverse as you please, but neither superhuman nor subhuman." There is a possible sentimental reason: the poet's tenderness for his early verse, which had been excluded from the volume of *Works*, published shortly before and purporting to be a complete collection; there is also a possible financial reason: Pope would realize that these poems had a certain market value, and that to burn them was simply to throw money away. Besides, this is not the only case in which Pope had recourse to anonymity; he did so for many other poems, because they failed to reach his standard of perfection, or were not the kind of thing he was primarily concerned with or wished to be remembered by. Certainly none of these motives advanced by Mr. Ault is superhuman or subhuman; but such is neither the love of gratuitous mystification and intrigue — of which, again, this would not be the only instance in Pope's career. Only, on such love of mystification those wretched psychologists would eagerly seize, and — what wouldn't they say?

Let us, however, congratulate Mr. Ault for having found a very harmless source of a phrase recurring in Pope and stating "a moral problem which seems to have been almost an obsession with him." The line: "Is it, in heav'n, a crime to love too well?" of the *Unfortunate Lady*, echoed also in a pre-romantic passage of *Eloisa to Abelard*, is found in a translation, now ascribed to Pope, of Castiglione's *On the Statue of Cleopatra*: "I knew no crime, if 'tis no crime to love", where the Latin text has: "Vixi sine crimine si non Crimen amare vocas."

Indeed, curious as it may sound, it is rather refreshing to turn from the study of contemporary gossip and literary gangs — out of which material Pope's life, it is hoped, may be extricated some day, — to a sound research of literary sources as the one embodied in M. Audra's monumental work.

M. Audra's book partly covers the same ground as Prof. Austin Warren's *Alexander Pope as Critic and Humanist* (Princeton Studies in English, I, 1929, pp. viii-289, now out of print), which, although an early work by that admirable American scholar, remains still, thanks to the soundness of the method and the keen perceptions of the critic, one of the most valuable contributions to our knowledge of Pope. M. Audra's research, apparently limited to the French models of Pope, has actually resulted in the most complete account of Pope's methods of composition, as well as artistic theories. Pope's dependence on the French critics for his conception of an ideal Nature, for instance, is fully illustrated; thus we see the classical ideals of the *grand siècle* handed over to the neo-classicists of the XVIIIth century through Pope, for it is no far cry from Pope's idea of "nature" and "simplicity" in pastoral poetry, obtained by "exposing the best side only of a shepherd's life, and concealing its miseries" (from Fontenelle's: "n'offrir aux yeux que la tranquillité de la vie pastorale, dont on dissimule la bassesse: on en laisse voir la simplicité, mais on en cache la misère"), to Winckelmann's ideal nature as typified in the Apollo of Belvedere, in whose figure "no trace can be found of the needs of humanity". M. Audra stresses the part played by Dryden in making of Pope a follower of the French critics; the source of the famous line in the *Essay on Criticism*, according to which the Rules "are Nature still, but Nature methodiz'd" may be seen in Rapin's definition of Aristotle's *Poetics* (in the Preface to the *Réflexions sur la Poétique*) as "la Nature mise en méthode"; but very likely Pope came across that expression for the first time in the preface to Dryden's

*Troilus and Cressida*, where it is duly emphasized. Dryden and Pope differ from the French critics in referring to Nature instead of Reason (for Boileau Nature is *Raison*, i.e. human nature, *bon sens*, *droit sens*), thus avoiding the more rigid and formal sides of French criticism. Where Boileau had said: "Aimez donc la Raison", Pope has: "First follow Nature". Under different names, they preached the same rule, at least apparently: but Aristotle's idea of Nature, refurbished by Pope under the influence of French criticism as interpreted by Dryden, became the starting-point of a new development: the Ideal Nature of the neo-classicists. Pope's passage on the perfection of the Ancients has already the ring of the neo-classical creed:

Still green with bays each ancient Altar stands,  
Above the reach of sacrilegious hands ...

The poet who seemed to have come closest to Nature was Homer, "because," — as Dr. Johnson put it, — "his positions are general, and his representations natural, with very little dependence on local or temporary customs." Hence the enormous importance of Homer in the controversy between the Ancients and the Moderns, and the reason of the success of Pope's translation. The study of Pope's indebtedness to French critics and translators of Homer forms one of the most remarkable sections of M. Audra's book. According to Madame Dacier, whose views strongly influenced Pope, Homer was the supreme type of that simple and severe grandeur of the primitive ages which became a kind of obsession with the XVIIIth century neo-classicists, until it took a political turn, and through the enthusiasm for Plutarch's heroes and republican Rome, inspired the French Revolution. While Madame Dacier compared Homer to the Bible and held any criticism of the Greek poet nothing short of impious, others, chiefly the verse translator Houdar La Motte, did not scruple to adapt Homer to the taste of their day. Pope, although professing to share the views of Madame Dacier, actually followed a *via media*, placed Homer above all the Ancients for the fire of invention, found in him, in the wake of Longinus, the example of a genius beyond the reach of art and the rules, and, in so doing, anticipated the romantics; contrasted, as Addison had done, Homer's "wild paradise" to Virgil's "well-ordered garden"; then, in his own translation, on the one hand turned that wild paradise into a classical garden through the measured symmetry of his verse, and the brilliant and artificial pattern of antithetical wit (see on this point Prof. George Williamson's thorough study of *The Rhetorical Pattern of Neo-classical Wit in Modern Philology*, Vol. XXXIII, no. 1, August 1935), — coming, in this, very close to La Motte —; on the other hand he introduced all kinds of *coloratura*; in the first case Pope was guided by a neo-classical criterion; in the second he let his pen be ruled by the Picturesque, which is admittedly a romantic category. Pope tried either to obliterate or to ennoble the rustic aspects of Homer, and emphasized the heroic ones, to the extent of conferring a uniform character of heroic grandeur upon the whole. Thus Pope's *Homer* achieves an image of massive antiquity which more than anticipates the manner of David and his school.

But if French criticism was largely responsible for Pope's interpretation  
E.S. XIX. 1937.



of Homer on a magnified scale, where did he find inspiration for such variations as the one contained in the rendering of *Iliad*, V, 35 :

Removed from fight, on Xanthus' flowery bounds  
They sat, and listen'd to the dying sounds?

or this one, from the long simile of *Iliad*, XVIII, 205 ff. :

Thick on the hills the flaming beacons blaze ;  
With long-projected beams the seas are bright?

The poet who thus "improved" Homer's text, was the same potential romantic who wrote about the grotto in Twickenham: "From that distance under the temple you look down through a sloping arcade of trees, and see the sails on the river passing suddenly and vanishing as through a perspective glass." As I have remarked above, there is much of Pope's character that we can read in the Twickenham episode; the formal garden with its symmetrical rows of trees and mounts, its obelisk, its shell temple, and the surprising perspective, and, on the other hand, that fairy grotto and "the aquatic idea of the whole place": is not this garden an emblem, also, of the twofold aspect, neo-classical and pre-romantic, of Pope's art?

Rome.

MARIO PRAZ.

*William Blake, Versuch einer Entwicklungsgeschichte des Mystikers. Erster Teil bis 1795.* Von WALDEMAR BAGDASARIANZ. (Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, Band 2.) 171 pp. Zürich und Leipzig: Max Niehans Verlag. 1936. Sw. fr. 6.50.

This work, as the title implies, is the first instalment of an attempt to trace out the development of Blake's mystical philosophy and to reduce it, as far as possible, to an ordered form. Some of the ground has been traversed before, notably by Denis Saurat and Max Plowman, and also by Professor Bernhard Fehr in *Englische Studien* for the year 1920; Dr. Bagdasarianz's achievement is not so much that he has brought forward any really new theories upon Blake, as that he has collated and re-surveyed some of those advanced already, illustrated them with an abundance of quotation from the poet's writings, and reduced a rather puzzling and abstruse system of thought to something like coherence. After an opening chapter upon the general significance of Blake's view of life, with its primary insistence upon the two-fold nature of man, the subject is discussed successively under the headings of "Knowledge and Faith", "Good and Evil", "Law and Liberty", and it must be confessed that though the student may not subscribe to every one of the arguments advanced by Dr. Bagdasarianz, at the end of each section issues will be a good deal clearer for him.

The theme is developed at some length and in considerable detail, but the conclusions arrived at are comparatively few in number, and very definite. Dr. Bagdasarianz promises us a further investigation, in a future volume, into the influence of Swedenborg and Jakob Boehme; he has, nevertheless, given some very useful indications here, for the general drift of his book

is to show that while the former of these teachers captured the mind of Blake in his youth and exercised an influence over his early writings, the really important works, on which his reputation will finally rest, were produced under the inspiration of Boehme. There would not be much point in summarising, in a review of this length, even the main conclusions at which Dr. Bagdasarianz arrives; some, must, however, be stated, since certain questions arise from them which merit discussion, and which it is to be hoped the author may find room to consider in his next volume. To Blake, he insists (and quite rightly so) man was essentially an eternal spirit, created in God's own image, and therefore naturally good; the earthly (or evil) side of the human being was not the real side, and whenever he spoke of "man", without any qualifying adjective, it was the spiritual man that he had in mind. But to try and separate soul and body (the spiritual and the material) as two distinct attributes of being was to Blake incomprehensible, for he believed that the Divine Spirit had incarnated itself in every created thing, and most of all in man (as witness "The Divine Image" in *Songs of Innocence*). So far so good; but what of the logical outcome of this position? Blake's philosophy as summarised above reads very much like the doctrine of immanence as expounded by James Martineau in the mid-nineteenth century, and I must say that it amazes me that Blake (at least, so far as I read his writings) never fully accepted that doctrine and its natural corollary, the full humanity of Jesus.

Again, in the chapter on "Good and Evil" two other questions arise which seem to be worth discussion: namely, how far was Blake the heir of the eighteenth century, faced with the same problems as the neo-classic poets of the mid-century and the Deists of the earlier years, and how far did he anticipate the nineteenth century theory of evolution? "Know thou thyself" was one of the cardinal points of Deist doctrine, and Blake, too, believed that that was the duty of man, for only so could he ever escape from the shackles of earthly desires and come to realise the high possibilities of his being; but where the Deist's self-knowledge depended upon what Dr. Bagdasarianz includes in the term "Wissen", Blake's depended upon "Glauben". Now quite obviously Blake's conception of fundamental human nature implied a belief in a benevolent purpose in and behind creation, and this brought him face to face with the tremendous problem of evil and its continuous conflict with good, a conflict which is symbolised in *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*. Evil, he states, differs from good in the same way that darkness differs from light, and the two, again like darkness and light, are merely relative. Anything that ennobles the purpose of our being is good, anything that degrades it, evil. Nor is evil a positive quality, like good, emanating from the Universal Spirit, but a distortion or an abuse of good. Conflict is necessary to existence, and the so-called conflict between good and evil is actually a sign that God is here and now actively working out a divine purpose in the world and urging man to aspire to moral planes ever more lofty. The moral goal of one age becomes the vicious shackles of another. Every evil is a lower stage of good, above which the race has long since risen, but which still clings tenaciously and against which the spiritual man must fight or to which he must succumb. Hence finally salvation lies not in sacraments, in rites or in obedience to formulated moral codes, but in the escape from that materialism which would degrade the divine in man. Had Blake, unwittingly, advanced a

theory of evolution half a century before it was seriously accepted by scientists, and carried it into a sphere where even Darwin and his early followers did not dare to tread? It certainly seems that he had come near to it.

These are only a few of the questions that a reading of this book arouses; no doubt every reader will have queries and difficulties of his own. It is certainly a book which causes one to think carefully over Blake's philosophy and its implications, because of the lucidity and the logic of the treatment. Perhaps it is the implications that are more interesting than the philosophy itself.

Sheffield.

FREDERICK T. WOOD.

*Dostojewskijs Einfluss auf den englischen Roman.* Von  
WALTER NEUSCHÄFFER. (Anglistische Forschungen, Heft 81).  
110 pp. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 1935. 5.60 Mk.

The English reading public was slow to appreciate Dostoevsky's novels. Though not a few English writers felt the great Russian's force, and studied his method of describing the movements of the soul, he did not win many whole-hearted admirers among them. Conrad, who probably learnt more from him than any other English novelist, actually hated his teacher. Galsworthy, George Moore, Arnold Bennett, and even Virginia Woolf spoke severely of him at one time or other. Neuschäffer answers the question after the reason for this reserved attitude convincingly. The lack of restraint in Dostoevsky's method of composing and in his figures' way of laying bare their inner selves, of giving voice to their most intimate emotions, especially those of a dolorous kind, repelled or disconcerted English minds. But though they felt unable always to approve of what they were reading, they could not escape the fascination of Dostoevsky's works.

The first period of interest in the Russian began in 1881. All those who admired the French naturalists at that time inevitably turned their eyes towards the novelists of Russia also. The foremost name in this group was George Gissing. He included some remarks on Dostoevsky in his study on Dickens (1898). They show clearly that he was trying to define the traits common to the Russian and the French novelists rather than the highly personal things in Dostoevsky. Gissing's own way of writing justifies the view that he was much more indebted to Zola than to any Russian author. — Neuschäffer arrives at more positive results in his chapter on Joseph Conrad. Dostoevsky's characters and situations were among Conrad's most important sources of inspiration. There are evident parallels between the figures of Raskolnikoff and Lord Jim and between Stevie in *The Secret Agent* and Prince Myschkin in *The Idiot*. A careful comparative analysis of *Under Western Eyes* and *Crime and Punishment* reveals many interesting points of connexion. The heroes of both novels are unable to endure the situation created by an undetected crime and are lashed into confession by their tortured conscience. Another human type,



well-known to the readers of Dostoevsky's *The Insulted and Injured*, is given a prominent place in Conrad's later works *Chance* and *Suspense*. — The Russian author was also of some importance in Somerset Maugham's literary career. The next weighty chapter in Neuschäffer's study, however, discusses Hugh Walpole, most of whose works are rich in reminiscences of the eastern master. This is especially true of his two novels treating Russian subjects: *The Dark Forest* and *The Secret City*. Many of Dostoevsky's and Walpole's heroes live in a certain isolation. They lose the power of distinguishing clearly between the real and the unreal. They experience seconds of utter stillness. A conviction of the relativity of all things rushes in upon them. Phantoms acquire the reality of men, and men are turned into phantoms. Both authors give a prominent place to dreams, and there are moments in their heroes' lives when the barrier between dream and reality grows indefinite and uncertain, moments when the laws of causality seem to lose their validity. — Ethel Sidgwick is placed among the authors indebted to Dostoevsky for character patterns and other details in their method of writing. — D. H. Lawrence introduces another group. He, too, followed the Russian in points of detail, but his main interest in him was philosophical. He recognized types of men and women in Dostoevsky's novels whom he believed to know from his western experience, and whom he abhorred. Dimitri and Iwan Karamazoff are striking examples of two of these types: the one egotistical, sensual, desiring "to be pure absolute self, all devouring, all consuming"; the other a doubting intellectual, incapable of willing. Some of the women in Lawrence's own works (Gudrun in *Women in Love*, Ursula in *The Rainbow*) belong to the first, many of his men to the second of these groups. Lawrence got nothing positive out of Dostoevsky. He noticed merely the dark side of his characters, and, therefore, could not learn more from him than how people should not be. — Also Aldous Huxley was powerfully attracted by the philosophical side of Dostoevsky's books. Though the Russian's religious fervour could not mean much to him, he was impressed when he found that the author of *The Possessed* had been writing the diagnosis of a cultural disease which he was himself struggling against: a highly intelligent modern's incapacity of discovering a purpose for which to exert his will. The pitiless description of the degradation wrought by this insidious affliction in a man apparently born for better things fascinated him. Stavrogin's name occurs frequently in Huxley's works. Spandrell, in *Point-Counter-Point*, is evidently a descendant of this figure. Neuschäffer errs, however, when he tries to establish a similarity between Stavrogin and John, the savage, in *Brave New World* (p. 73). The structures of their characters, the reasons for their suicides are totally different. There is more to his remarks on a relationship between the famous tale of the grand-inquisitor in *The Brothers Karamazoff* and the interview granted by Mustapha Mond to his prisoners Bernard Marx, Helmholtz Watson and John, the savage. — At the close of this chapter Neuschäffer points out that Beverley Nichols also devoted a novel to Stavrogin's disease (*Crazy Pavements*). — Then he proceeds to show that Dostoevsky's method may have been of considerable help to Virginia Woolf and Dorothy Richardson in their attempt to find a new form of art that can hardly lay claim to the title of "novel". He observes mainly two parallels: in both cases a tendency to concentrate

completely on the world as seen and reacted upon by a particular mind, to stress the inner experiences of the doer instead of the deed, and to dissolve the notion of epical time.

Neuschäffer's study is well balanced, since he thought it not enough to enumerate instances of direct borrowings of English authors from Dostoievsky, but did his best to estimate the less tangible effects of those sparks that, in springing from one writer to another, leave traces in the whole tenor of a work rather than in easily recognizable details.

Basel.

R. STAMM.

*David-Herbert Lawrence et les récentes idéologies allemandes.*  
Par ERNEST SEILLIÈRE, Membre de l'Institut. xviii + 282 pp.  
Paris: Boivin. 1936. 15 francs.

The tracing of philosophical currents and the showing up of 'influences' has rarely been done with more gusto than in this book. M. Seillière is well known as an especially capable advocate of a neo-humanism whose chief enemy is the naturalist philosophy of Rousseau and the Romantics. He has traced their baneful effect in most of the literatures of modern Europe and consequently is thoroughly acquainted with German thought, turning his knowledge to good account in his study of the influence upon Lawrence of the work of Bachofen, Nietzsche, Klages, Rudolf Steiner, Spengler and others. He maintains that Lawrence was not only influenced by all these thinkers, but that he achieved an original synthesis of French and German romanticism.

The question whether Lawrence actually knew the works of those German philosophers should have been, in a study of this scope, made a matter for accurate preliminary research. The difficulties to overcome are no doubt great. Thus, in the case of Klages, to whom M. Seillière ascribes a preponderating importance, the author is compelled to confess complete ignorance of any definite facts: "Je ne sais si Lawrence a connu quelque chose de lui: le poète anglais reste, je l'ai dit, peu loquace sur le chapitre de ses lectures" (p. 17). But then, it seems so natural to conjecture that "En tout cas il a dû lui faire plus d'un emprunt à travers les nombreux écrivains d'outre-Rhin qui ont vulgarisé, depuis quelque quinze ans, les thèses du solitaire de Zurich". Is this conclusive? May not Lawrence just have arrived independently at such of his views as resemble those of Ludwig Klages?

In his second chapter, entitled *Apologie du passé lointain*, M. Seillière holds that the theories of Oswald Spengler were probably responsible for Lawrence's singing the praises of the bushman's mentality as he did in his novel *Kangaroo*. A vague romantic craving for complete naturalness caused the novelist to abhor most of the human races now living and made him regret the extinction of the Celts, Aztecs, and Red Indians. The pages of this chapter are more thickly interspersed than the rest of the book with samples of M. Seillière's own philosophy of 'rational imperialism'. Carried away by his own intense convictions the author frequently forgets his

original intention which was to expound certain trends of philosophical opinion. His style becomes dramatic, he corrects Lawrence, ticks off Spengler, and buttonholes the reader. Lawrence has given cause for much excited comment; but never, I think, for excitement of this rather curious sort.

The third chapter, *Critique du présent*, contains a summary of Lawrence's attacks on Puritanism, Christianity, socialism, and on the mechanisation of the modern world. The next two chapters deal with his messianic attitude, his constructive vitalism, his deification of the body, and his personal interpretation of psycho-analysis. The author explains in his own fashion Lawrence's marriage with Frieda and analyses the novelist's conception of the rôle of the sexes in a survey of *Women in Love*, *St. Mawr*, *The Plumed Serpent*, and *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. There is almost admiration in M. Seillière's description of Lawrence's ideal of masculinity: "Nul autre poète romantique n'a peut-être été aussi sincère, je crois, dans la déification lyrique de sa propre personne. Le psaume passionnel emporté célèbre l'homme bien plutôt que la femme et cela sur la lyre d'un homme: ce qui fait son originalité" (p. 184).

In his last chapter the author speaks chiefly of the social theories outlined in the novels, and he seriously undertakes to apply his unflinching *bon sens* to the *Fantasia of the Unconscious* — with what result may be imagined. The book is stimulating and entertaining, though it fails in many places to show anything like a real understanding of Lawrence's genius.

Solothurn.

H. W. HÄUSERMANN.

*Die Grammatik des englischen Sprachmeisters John Wallis (1616-1703).* Von MARTIN LEHNERT. (Sprache und Kultur der germanischen und romanischen Völker. A. Anglistische Reihe. Band xxi.) ix + 156 pp. Breslau: Priebatsch. 1936. 6.80 RM.

John Wallis was one of those scholars, not rare in the seventeenth century, who had made themselves masters of all the various branches of learning of their time. His chief fame rests on his mathematical work: he is looked upon as one of the forerunners of Newton, and he held the Savilian professorship of geometry in Oxford from 1649. His studies embraced logic, metaphysics, physics, astronomy, medicine, and in several of these subjects he published treatises. He was famous for his skill in deciphering, which was frequently made use of by the authorities. He invented a method for the teaching of deaf-mutes. He was also a theologian and published several collections of sermons and theological tracts: he held benefices in London from 1643 on and he became a Doctor of Divinity in 1653. He was one of the founders of the Royal Society, and he was a friend and correspondent of Samuel Pepys. Clearly Wallis was a personality of no small interest. Numerous biographies of him have been published, and of these Dr. Lehnert has made ample use in his full and valuable account of Wallis's life and work.

Wallis also made an important contribution to English philology by his English Grammar, *Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae*, first published in 1653.



The value of Wallis's grammar as a source for the history of English pronunciation has long been recognized, and the book has been made diligent use of by all writers on the subject from Ellis on. But a modern reprint of the grammar has never been published. One reason for this is no doubt the fact that copies of the original editions, which show only slight variations, are accessible in many libraries, in England as well as on the Continent. A copy of the 1765 edition, by the way, is found in Lund University Library. Yet a modern reprint is really desirable. Dr. Lehnert's book does not contain one, but it gives helpful and valuable lists of the additions found in the various editions.

In view of Wallis's universal learning and scientific training, it was to be expected that when he turned to English grammar he would produce a book superior to earlier attempts in this field. As a matter of fact the grammar may be looked upon as a pioneer work. On the other hand it seems to me to be going a little too far to reckon him as the founder of phonetic science, as has been actually done. It has not been made out how much Wallis owes to early classical grammarians. And while it is no doubt true that in his descriptions of sounds and in his system of sounds he is in advance of his time, yet it is an exaggeration to identify his vowel-system with Bell-Sweet's, as Dr. Lehnert does. Wallis draws up a scheme of nine vowels arranged in nine squares, which bear an outward resemblance to Sweet's well-known rectangle. But of his three guttural vowels only two, *o* in *folly* and the vowel in *cut*, are back, while 'e foemininum' [ə] is not one. The so-called palatal vowels, those in *same*, *seat*, *feet*, are surely not identical with Sweet's mixed, and his labials, those in *boat*, *fool*, *muse*, are not identical with Sweet's front. The systems are radically different. Wallis's services to philology are considerable, but they should not be overestimated.

Most important for us are Wallis's descriptions of sounds, especially the vowels. These often allow us to determine the sounds in use at his time with a fair degree of accuracy. The pronunciation he has in view was doubtless educated London and Oxford English. He was born in Kent, and he spent the chief part of his time in London and Oxford. But his book has certain grave shortcomings. Wallis was not a modern phonetician, and he doubtless made many mistakes; that, however, is on the whole a minor matter. But he was too much influenced by the written word and he often gives pronunciations such as they should be in view of the spelling. He is prejudiced by a certain desire to schematize. He does not seem to have had a very accurate ear for phonetic distinctions. His comparisons with foreign sounds sometimes indicate insufficient familiarity with foreign languages. His information is rather scrappy, at least on many points. One would suppose, for instance, that he made a distinction in his own pronunciation between the *o*-sounds in *born* and *borne* and the like, a distinction made by Hodges (1644) and Cooper (1685), but nothing is said about the matter. No remark is made on the vowels in words like *bear*, *tear* or *broad*. We may well suspect that Wallis pronounced the vowel in *bear* or *broad* in the same way as Cooper did. This general view of Wallis's value as an authority for early English pronunciation is, I believe, fairly generally accepted nowadays, and it is also in the main that held by Dr. Lehnert, who fully discusses and criticizes the old grammarian, especially pp. 47-52.

In the first section of his book, I. Abschnitt, Einleitung (pp. 1-59), Dr. Lehnert, besides the biographical data (pp. 1-22) and an interesting account of Wallis's contribution to the teaching of deaf-mutes (pp. 22-36), gives the general results of his study of Wallis's grammar. Of particular importance is here the full account of the various editions of the grammar. Six editions appeared during Wallis's own lifetime (1653, 1664, 1672, 1674, 1688, 1699). All, except that of 1688, which seems to have been unauthorized, were edited by the author himself and were corrected and augmented by him. The changes are few and of small importance, except for the edition of 1699, which embodies a good many additional examples. Each new edition is based on the preceding one. After Wallis's death there appeared editions in 1727, 1731, 1740, all printed abroad, and finally that of 1765, which contains a verbatim reprint of the 1699 edition. The last edition can thus be safely used, and Dr. Lehnert shows that it must have been that used by Ellis.

The second section, II. Abschnitt, Phonetischer Teil, is fairly brief (pp. 60-83) and does not give rise to much comment. Something has been said already on Dr. Lehnert's view regarding Wallis's vowel-system. A special point will be discussed *infra*.

The third section, III. Abschnitt, Lautgeschichtlicher Teil, fills pp. 84-146 and is the most important part of the treatise. Dr. Lehnert here fully discusses the statements on English pronunciation and the examples illustrating it given by Wallis, and draws conclusions from them concerning the pronunciation of English in Wallis's time. The general results obtained by the author may as a rule be accepted, and Dr. Lehnert shows good judgment and a wide knowledge of the history of early English pronunciation and familiarity with the literature on the subject. In most cases, it is true, these results coincide on the whole with those obtained by previous scholars. And it seems to me that this chapter, as well as parts of the others, might well have been a good deal shorter. The general facts of early Modern English sound-development are nowadays fairly well known, and it was hardly necessary to quote other early orthoepists in such detail as is done in the book. Of course an exception should have been made for special cases, where something really new was to be found.

The final section, IV. Abschnitt, Wörterverzeichnis, contains very welcome lists of words found in the various editions of the grammar. The first list gives all the words mentioned by Wallis in the first edition (1653). The following lists contain all the additional examples found in the later editions. Here it can be seen at a glance that the edition of 1664 contains only one additional example (*trough*), while that of 1674 contains 14 new words and the additions in that of 1699 fill a page and a half.

A few points of detail will be discussed a little more fully. Incidentally I remark that on p. 11 *Fan-church street* and *Westminster* should be *Fenchurch Street, Westminster*.

On p. 74 (§ 78) the author concludes from Wallis's statement that 'é masculinum' could not be pronounced before *r*, but that 'e foemininum' must be pronounced there, that at Wallis's time *r* was no longer a trilled sound. Surely Wallis pronounced 'é masculinum' before *r* in *there*, which is actually mentioned among words containing this sound on p. 9 (ed. 1765), and in words such as *ferry*, *merry*, which he does not mention. Wallis's statement should not be taken literally. He says that *e* could hardly be pronounced as

'é masculinum' [e] before *r*, as in *vertue*, *liberty*, *stranger*, but he is apparently here thinking chiefly of *e* in unstressed syllables and forgot for the moment cases like *ferry*, *merry*, *very* etc. In any case it is difficult to see that any conclusion as regards the pronunciation of *r* could be drawn from the influence exerted on *e* by a following *r*.

P. 84 (§ 87). Cooper does not give [i] as the vowel in *friend*. He says that *i* is silent in *friend* as in *fieldfare*, *heifer*, *receive* and others. Jones, the editor of Cooper, has misunderstood the statement. Cooper's form was evidently [frend], and the vowel [e] is doubtless to be assumed also for *fieldfare* and *heifer*, while *deceive* and others had the vowel usually denoted by *e*, as in *these* etc., i.e. an open *i*-sound. — In the same paragraph the explanation of Wallis's long *i* in *inne* 'inn' cannot be accepted. Dr. Lehnert assumes dialectal lengthening, found in Somerset, Dorset and Devon dialects in words such as *bid*, *bit*. It is difficult to see why Wallis should have adopted a south-western dialect form. Nor is *inn* with a long vowel pointed out in these dialects. If Wallis's form is trustworthy, I suppose it must have developed as an adverb, and is analogous to ME forms such as *in*, *ōn*, German *ein* by the side of *in*. On this kind of lengthening see Luick, *Hist. Gr.* § 390 with references.

P. 91 (§ 98). Cooper does not give the vowel [ɔ:] in words such as *halm*, *qualm*. He merely states that the *l* was silent.

P. 93 ff. (§§ 103 etc.). The discussion of the pronunciation of the vowel in words such as *cut* is not convincing. All we can say is that a vowel similar to present English [ʌ] was used. The description ("effertur sono obscuro") and the comparison with *eu* in French *serviteur* and Welsh *y* do not help us much. There is no reason to assume a vowel of an *ö*-type.

P. 129 (§ 163). I am not convinced by the explanation of *-a-* in *blackamoor*. Dr. Lehnert suggests that *blacka-* is a modification of *blacky*, a side-form of *black*. The earliest forms do not bear out this theory. I suppose the *-a-* is a relic of the unstressed ME vowel, as Wallis himself suggests. In the NED this explanation is mentioned, but it is said that the suggestion is, in the present state of the evidence, at variance with the phonetic history of the language. However, later research has shown that a medial vowel is frequently preserved in Devon place-names, as *Langaford*, *Priestaford* and the like. See *Place-names of Devon*, p. xxxvi. The word *blackamoor* may have come into Standard English from a south-western dialect.

Lund.

EILERT EKWALL.

*Growth and Structure of the English Language.* By OTTO JESPERSEN. Eighth edition. 239 pp. Leipzig: Teubner. 1935. Sewed RM. 4.50, cloth RM. 5.40.

*A History of the English Language.* By ALBERT C. BAUGH. xiii + 509 pp. New York & London: D. Appleton-Century Company. 1935. 12s. 6d.

Two years ago the house of Teubner published the eighth edition of Jespersen's little classic, thirty years exactly after the first. It is significant



that of these eight editions the last four date after 1923 (the second was published in 1912) so that, if we may assume the number of copies printed of each edition to have been the same, there has actually been an acceleration in the demand for the book in what is still conveniently termed the post-war period — this in spite of the fact that it has been reprinted each time practically unaltered. The significance of these figures lies in their testimony to the continued prestige of that mitigated form of historical language study that became prevalent about the turn of the century, and for which Jespersen's name may be almost taken as a symbol. It differs from the older school by its emphasis on the living stage of the language, while refusing, after 1915, to go all the way with the new ideas emanating from Geneva and Prague. Its leading principle is well expressed in the title of Jespersen's greatest, though still unfinished, work: *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. Its manifesto, in brief, is contained in the Preface to Part IV of the *Grammar* (1931):

As the title indicates, this is a grammar of Modern English, i.e. the period from Caxton to our own days, and the treatment is historical. As there are still scholars who will not recognize an English grammar as historical unless its centre of gravity is in or even before the Anglo-Saxon period, it may not be superfluous here to state my conviction that history is of value even if it deals with recent periods only, and that, on the other hand, the truly historical point of view leads to a recognition of the right to exist of present-day usage, however widely it may differ from the language of former periods. Much has been written lately against the one-sidedly historical school of linguistics, and stress has been laid on the importance of the grammatical description of the language of one definite period. But when Ferdinand de Saussure and his followers insist on a sharp line of division between what they call diachronic and synchronic linguistics, their view is to my mind exaggerated: the two subjects cannot and should not be rigidly separated, least of all in a language possessing so strong a literary tradition as English. I have therefore tried to combine both points of view, arranging, wherever my material allowed it, the historical evidence so as to lead up to a statement of present usage

In practice as well as theory the method may, with due deference to the achievement of a great scholar, be described as the endeavour to make the best of both (linguistic) worlds.

In Jespersen's case this view of language study is combined with a reasoned belief in the progress of the English language in the direction of clearness and simplicity. In word-formation as well as in the other main divisions of grammar he observes a general tendency 'from chaos towards cosmos' (*Growth and Structure*, § 178); modern English 'has got rid of a great many superfluities found in earlier English as well as in most cognate languages' (*ibid.* § 7). 'Phonetically speaking' it possesses 'male energy, but not brutal force' (*ibid.* § 6). By the standard of logic 'there is perhaps no language in the civilized world that stands so high as English' (*ibid.* § 15). And, 'as the language is, so also is the nation' (§ 19). In this connection it may be noted that though 'to show ... the relation of language to national character' (§ 1) is one of the avowed purposes of the book, little attempt is made to relate the national character of older periods to the 'chaos' and 'superfluities' ascribed to the language of those times. True, we read that 'it is characteristic of primitive peoples that their languages are highly specialized' (§ 51); the wholesale adoption of French words after the Conquest is connected 'with that trait of [the English] character which in its exaggerated form has in modern times been termed

snobbism or toadyism' (§ 93); and by abolishing the 'useless distinction between *thou* and *you* 'English has attained the only manner of address worthy of a nation that respects the elementary rights of each individual' (§ 239). But if we may denote the four terms: modern English — modern national character — older English — older national character, by *a*, *b*, *c* and *d* respectively, we shall find that though a certain relation is postulated between *a* and *b*, and a certain development from *c* to *a*, we are not clearly shown the parallel relation between *c* and *d*, and the parallel development from *d* to *b*, that must likewise be demonstrated if the author's conclusions are to carry conviction.

There can be no question of enumerating, let alone discussing, all the various features of *Growth and Structure*, nor is there any need: they are familiar to all students of English philology. One or two remarks may perhaps be offered in exchange for the instruction derived from a renewed reading.<sup>1</sup> In the first place: would it not be possible to bring some of the sections dealing with modern English up to date in the next edition? In § 158, for instance, a list is given of trade names found in a single number of one magazine. Most of these are now deader than the proverbial dodo; in fact, as the author himself remarks, the list dates from January 1900, and 'a great many of the names will probably be extinct by now'. Then why not replace them by something fresh? — The same remark applies to the samples of journalese quoted from the *Biglow Papers* (§ 148); I doubt if they represent the newspaper style of the nineteen thirties. — Similarly, when we think of 'recent political terms taken over bodily from the German', it is surely not *hinterland* and *weltpolitik* that occur to us in the first place, though this may have been the case thirty years ago (§ 153 n.); nor does *wireless* suggest a 'telegram' (§ 138 n.) to most people nowadays. — Is the 'gulf' which 'separates the grammar of poetry from that of ordinary life' (§ 232) as wide at the present day as it was in the nineteenth century? — We are told that there was no space for a chapter on American and Colonial English (§ 248); but as Americanisms are occasionally mentioned it might have been well to point out in § 245 that the offensive meaning attaching to modern English *bloody* is unknown in America.

In § 247, apropos of a remark by Elworthy on prudery among Somerset peasants causing 'the plain old English names for the male animals' to go out of use, Jespersen observes: 'I am afraid we have here alighted on a trait which does not bear out my description (in the introductory chapter) of English as a masculine language. However, this tendency now belongs to ancient history.' There are survivals down to our own day, though, as the reviewer found a few months ago when applying to a West-Country clergyman of his acquaintance for information on a number of agricultural and pastoral terms:

In the country the word 'udder' is indecent. The country folk if they must refer to it call it the 'bag'. Of course the cowmen talk of anything without shame among themselves just as doctors do.

---

<sup>1</sup> The eighth edition contains a small number of misprints: *trigg* (§ 66) should be *trig*; *Stetton* (p. 77, n.) should be *Stenton*; *An couple* (§ 94) should, of course, be *A couple*; for *premises* (§ 119) read *premisses* (does the word really mean 'adjuncts of a building' ?); *similary* (§ 140) should be *similarly*; the second *l* in *peculiarly* (§ 152) has not printed off; *ocassion* (§ 157) should be *occasion*.

## So much for the continuity of Victorianism !

Baugh's *History of the English Language* comes to us from America. Inevitably it covers much of the ground traversed in Jespersen's *Growth and Structure*, though it is as independent in treatment as is possible for a writer who views the subject largely from the same angle. Written primarily for 'college students', the book aims at inculcating 'enlightened views' even more emphatically than Jespersen's. One also finds the same pragmatic outlook on linguistic phenomena: 'Since grammatical simplification appears to be a mark of progress in language, English has some right to be considered the most advanced among the languages of Europe today' (§ 10). As in *Growth and Structure*, the historical development of English is presented 'in such a way as to preserve a proper balance between what may be called internal history — sound and inflections — and external history, — the political, social, and intellectual forces that have determined the course of that development at different periods' (Preface).

Yet a student who, after assimilating *Growth and Structure*, should take the trouble to work through the American book, will not find his labour wasted. The chapters on the Middle English period especially make profitable reading. Instructive parallels are drawn between linguistic conditions in post-Conquest England and those in modern Belgium, though here and there, as in connection with the *Statute of Pleading* (1362), the analogy might have been pressed a little further: 'Custom dies hard, and there is some reason to think that the statute was not fully observed at once' (§ 105). The sections 91-109, on the knowledge of English and French in England from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries, are among the most interesting in the book.

The treatment of the modern period is less satisfactory. Though they contain much useful information, more space is devoted in chapters VIII-X to the history of the views on the English language than to that of the language itself. The former is, no doubt, an engrossing subject, though the prominence given it in this book is probably accounted for by its educational purpose. The limitations of the eighteenth-century grammarians and reformers are held up as a warning example to the student who may be inclined to attach too much importance to 'authority'. 'At the root of all their mistakes was their ignorance of the processes of linguistic change' (§ 204). 'Doubtless the best safeguard against prejudice is knowledge, and some knowledge of the history of English in the past is necessary to an enlightened judgment in matters affecting present use' (§ 237). Many linguists nowadays would hold this kind of argument to be fallacious; but if anything can persuade American students of the utility of historical language study, Professor Baugh's *History* ought to go far towards accomplishing that purpose.

In spite of its questionable premiss<sup>2</sup>, the book may be warmly

---

<sup>2</sup> and of some debatable points, which may be dealt with in a note. The assertion that the importance of a language depends, among other things, on whether the nations (*sic*) using it 'pay their debts to other nations' and on their 'economic soundness' (§ 5) is such as one might have expected to come across in a Hearst newspaper, but hardly in a scholarly work. — The remark that English has adopted 'natural in place of grammatical gender' (§ 11) shows that the author's own views are not so 'enlightened' as they might be. In English as well as in any other language, 'gender' is a grammatical,



recommended to European students too, not least for its chapter on the English language in America. 'The speech of England can no longer be considered the norm by which all others must be judged' (§ 227) is a warning that all writers on modern English would do well to bear in mind. Like many American scholars, however, Professor Baugh is inclined to underrate the actual difference between English and American. 'It is well to remember that in the written language the difference between the English and the American use of words is often so slight that it is difficult to tell, in the case of a serious book, on which side of the Atlantic it was written' (§ 253). Surely this only holds for writers who make a conscious effort to imitate that English norm the universal validity of which the author himself repudiates. It would not be difficult to collect from his own book a dozen sentences, phrases and words which in their context could have been penned by none but an American. At the same time the number is not large enough, we trust, to deter any prospective student of this well-written volume.

The Hague.

R. W. ZANDVOORT.

### Brief Mention

In an article entitled 'Wird England Radikal?' contributed to a recent number of the *Neue Schweizer Rundschau* Dr. Heinrich Straumann discusses the 'leftist' tendencies in contemporary English literature and in intellectual circles generally. He points out the contributions to the radical current of thought made by Shaw, Wells, D. H. Lawrence (*Kangaroo*) and Aldous Huxley. What the author calls 'British Socialism' is not to be compared to any leftist movement on the Continent, no more than the Labour Party is to be identified with continental socialist parties. 'Es handelt sich vielmehr auch diesmal wieder um jene so häufig belegte Erscheinung, dass entscheidende geistesgeschichtliche Vorgänge in Europa, wie Renaissance und Reformation, Romantik und Realismus von England in ganz anderer Form und mit wesentlich veränderten Inhalten erlebt werden.' This has to be borne in mind when one hears English intellectuals describing themselves as 'communists'.

not a 'natural' category. What the author calls 'attributive' (?) gender 'as of a ship as feminine, sun and moon as masculine or feminine' clearly covers two different phenomena; the examples given (*ship* on the one hand, *sun* and *moon* on the other) are not on all fours. — What is said on the use of idiomatic expressions in § 12 has nothing to do with the simplification of inflections of which it is declared to be the result. — 'Speech is the product of certain muscular movements' (§ 13) is scarcely adequate as a definition. This whole section makes a confused impression. — A student unfamiliar with Old Germanic, and with the usual historical treatment of the subject in Old English grammars, will be hard put to it to reconcile the remarks on the vowel and consonant stems, the former divided into *a*, *ō*, *i* and *u* stems, in § 41, with the paradigms given on the same page, viz., *stān*, *giefu*, *hunta*. Sweet's warning that 'to call the Old-English nouns *hūs* an *a*- or *o*- (why not an *e*-?) stem, *cynn* a *jo*-, *menigo* an *i* or *in*-stem, on the ground that in some other language the corresponding words ended in *-o*, &c., is, from an Old-English point of view, sheer nonsense' — is still lost on most writers of textbooks. — Luick's treatment of Middle English phonology is, unfortunately, confined to the vowels (p. 291, n.). — It might have been added that, since its foundation, ten years ago, nothing more has been heard of the 'International Council for English' (§ 233). — There are misprints on pp. 75, 130, 141 (*Pyrennees* instead of *Pyrenees*), 174, 198, 265, 321 and 473, most of which the reader can easily correct for himself; and probably on pp. 82 ('He has his day', qu. 'has had'?) and 341 ('straightening myself', qu. 'straitening'?).

First among the leaders of the movement Dr. Straumann mentions John MacMurray, Professor of Logic at University College, London, with his book *The Philosophy of Communism* (1934). After a paragraph on communism at Oxford, he refers to recent publications by Wickham Steed, Stephen King-Hall and George Dangerfield (*The Strange Death of Liberal England*, 1936). In the novel it is, among several other names, especially the young woman-author Storm Jameson, in the lyric Spender, Auden and C. D. Lewis who voice the radical sentiments. Alone on the other side we find Wyndham Lewis with his *Left Wings over Europe* (1936).

Shortly after Dr. Straumann's article appeared the publication was announced of a 'socialist' monthly, *Fact*, with Storm Jameson, Arthur Calder Marshall and Stephen Spender in charge of the literary section. Among the other 'contributing editors' are George Lansbury and Francis Meynell. (Publishing office: 66 Chandos Street, Charing Cross, London, W.C.2.)

We take this opportunity to recommend a very recent book on *England Heute und Morgen* by Kurt von Stutterheim, London correspondent of the *Berliner Tageblatt* since 1923 (Berlin, Herbig, 1937, 315 pp., RM. 6.80), a review of which will soon appear. — Z.

## Bibliography

### HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM

*Zur Vorgeschichte des "Beowulf."* Von W. A. BERENDSOHN. Mit einem Vorwort von O. Jespersen. 302 pp. Kopenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard. 1935. Kr. 15.—. [See Review, Febr. 1937.]

*Beowulf and the Seventh Century.* By R. GIRVAN. (Methuen's Old English Library, C. 1.) viii + 86 pp. London: Methuen. 1935. 3s. 6d. [See Review, Oct. 1936.]

*Das altenglische "Traumgesicht vom Kreuz".* Textkritisches, Literaturgeschichtliches, Kunstgeschichtliches. Von H. Bürow. (Anglistische Forschungen, 78.) viii + 185 pp. Heidelberg: Winter. 1935. Inland: geh. RM. 10.—; Ausland: geh. RM. 7.50. [A review will appear.]

*The Mural as a Decorative Device in Medieval Literature.* By E. L. HARRIS. vi + 89 pp. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press. 1935.

*Lazamon. An Attempt at Vindication.* By G. J. VISSER. 100 pp. Assen: Van Gorkum & Comp. N.V. 1935.

Diss. Utrecht.

*Quelques aspects de la littérature anglo-normande.* Par E. WALBERG. 146 pp. Paris: Droz. Fr. 16.—.

*The Relation and Development of English and Icelandic Outlaw-Traditions.* Door J. DE LANGE. (Nederlandsche Bijdragen op het gebied van Germaansche Philologie en Linguistiek, VI.) 138 pp. Haarlem: H. D. Tjeenk Willink & Zoon N.V. 1935. Price f 2.25. [A review will appear.]

*Die Historie von den vier Kaufleuten.* (Frederyke of Jennen.) *Die Geschichte von dem veräuschten Wiege* (The Mylnor of Abyngton). Von J. RATH. (Aus Schrifttum und Sprache der Angelsachsen. Bd. 4.) 160 pp. Leipzig: Noske. 1936. RM. 5.—.

*The Seege of Troye.* A Study in the Intertextual Relations of the Middle English Romance the "Seege or Batayle of Troye." By G. HOFSTRAND. (Lund Studies in English, IV. Professor Eilert Ekwall, Editor.) xv + 205 pp. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup. 1936. [See Review, Febr. 1937.]

*Alliterative Poetry in Middle English. A Survey of the Traditions.* By J. P. OAKDEN. With the assistance of E. R. INNES. x + 403 pp. Manchester: at the University Press. 1935. 20/— net. [A review will appear.]

*Englische Fürstenspiegel vom Policraticus Johannis von Salisbury bis zum Basilikon Doron König Jakobs I.* Von W. KLEINEKE. (Studien zur englischen Philologie, herausg. von L. Morsbach und H. O. Wilde, xc.) vii + 223 pp. Halle: Niemeyer. 1937. RM. 9.—. [A review will appear.]

*Boccaccio in der englischen Literatur von Chaucer bis Painters Palace of Pleasure.* Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der italienischen Novelle in England. Von J. RATH. (Aus Schrifttum und Sprache der Angelsachsen. Bd. 3.) viii + 167 pp. Leipzig: Noske. 1936. RM. 5.—. [A review will appear.]

*The Allegory of Love. A Study in Medieval Tradition.* By C. S. LEWIS. viii + 378 pp. Oxford. at the Clarendon Press. 1936. 15s. net. [A review will appear.]

*Die Aureate Terms als Stilelement bei Lydgate.* Von E. TILGNER. (Germanische Studien, 182 pp.) vii + 91 pp. Berlin: Ebering.

*Malory's Morte Darthur in the Light of a Recent Discovery.* By EUGÈNE VINAVER. (Reprinted from the "Bulletin of the John Rylands Library," Volume XIX., No. 2, July, 1935.) Manchester: University Press. 1s. 6d.

*The Early English Carols.* Edited by R. L. GREENE. cxlv + 461 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press; London: Milford. 1935. 30s. net.

*Peter Idley's Instructions to his Son.* Edited with Introduction and Notes by CH. D'EVELYN. (The Modern Language Association of America. Monograph Series, VI.) 240 pp. Boston: Heath & Company. London: Milford. 1935. 11/6 net. [A review will appear.]

*Roper's Life of More.* Edited by E. D. HITCHCOCK. (E.E.T.S. Orig. Series 197.) li + 142 pp. London: Milford. 1935. 10/— net. [A review will appear.]

*Miles Coverdale and the English Bible, 1488-1568.* By HENRY GUPPY. (Reprinted from the "Bulletin of the John Rylands Library," Volume XIX., No. 2, July, 1935.) Manchester: University Press. 1s. 6d.

*Sir Philip Sidney and the Arcadia.* By M. S. GOLDMAN. (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, XVII, 1-2.) 236 pp. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois. \$2.25. [A review will appear.]

*Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman.* By K. O. MYRICK. (Harvard Studies in English, XIV.) viii + 322 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1935. \$3.50. [A review will appear.]

*Spenser's Theory of Friendship.* By C. G. SMITH. viii + 74 pp. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1936. \$1.25. [See Review.]

*Two Centuries of Spenserian Scholarship (1609-1805).* By J. WURTSBAUGH. ix + 174 pp. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1936. \$2.25. [See Review.]

*Edmund Spenser. A Bibliographical Supplement.* By D. F. ATKINSON. xiv + 242 pp. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1937. \$3.00. [A review will appear.]

*Die dramatische Technik Thomas Kyds.* Studien zur inneren Struktur und szenischen Form des Elisabethanischen Dramas. Von P. W. BIESTERFELDT. 115 pp. Halle: Niemeyer. 1936. Geh. RM. 3.—. [A review will appear.]

*Florio's First Fruits.* Facsimile Reproduction of the Original Edition. By A. DEL RE. (Memoirs of the Faculty of Literature and Politics, Taihoku Imperial University. Vol. III, No. 1.) I: Text. 241 pp. II: Introduction and Notes. lxiv + 149 pp. Published by the Taihoku Imperial University, Formosa, Japan. 1936. Price ? [A review will appear.]

*Directions for Speech and Style.* By JOHN HOSKINS. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by H. H. HUDSON. (Princeton Studies in English, 12.) xl + 122 pp. Princeton: University Press. London: Milford. 1935. \$2.50. [A review will appear.]

*The Enchanted Glass. The Elizabethan Mind in Literature.* By HARDIN CRAIG. ix + 293 pp. New York & London: Oxford University Press. 1936. \$2.50 (10s. 6d.) [A review will appear.]

*The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy.* By W. FARNHAM. xiv + 487 pp. Berkeley: University of California Press. \$5.—.



# The Verbs with Direct and Indirect Object Re-Examined

(Conclusion \*)

**to leave.** P. says that the s.p.c. is only possible in the meaning of 'to bequeath'; but the constr. is not limited to this meaning. In Part II, Section II P. gives an example of the s.p.c. in the ordinary sense: *if she were left her other resources*<sup>356</sup>. Three more examples are adduced by J.: *she was left no resource but love; I am not left any choice; he was left but a short time to enjoy it*<sup>357</sup>. Cp. also: *he had been left a bad horse* (his own had been stolen)<sup>358</sup>. We can pronounce the s.p.c. quite current generally (Mr. F., Mr. M.).

It seems to have become the fashion, however, both in England and America, to substitute for the two non-p.o. constr. an inverted constr., in which either the thing-object (a), or, less frequently, the person-object (b) is replaced by a *with*-compl.

Examples a): (they) *leave me with the impression that...*<sup>359</sup>; how often does Mr. B. *leave people with an impression that ...*<sup>360</sup>; (the book) *leaves one with an impression that ...*<sup>361</sup>; ... *to leave (the visitors) with the impression that G. is an ideal country*<sup>362</sup>; the adjournment motion *leaves the Government with power to summon Parliament*<sup>363</sup>; (it) *leaves the Administration with the power to ...*<sup>364</sup>, etc. Examples seem to be as frequent or more frequent still in the passive: (they) *were left simply with the consolation that ...*<sup>365</sup>; *I am left with a subconscious awareness that ...*<sup>366</sup>; the reader *is left with the impression that ...*<sup>367</sup>; *we are left with*

---

\* As originally planned Dr. Kirchner's study was to have been completed in two or three parts of about sixteen pages each. In the course of the work, however, the materials have swollen to such an extent that to print them all would far exceed the capacity of this journal. With the author's consent we have, therefore, decided to select some of the longer and more important of the 250 entries for the letters l-z, and to refer for the remainder (as also for the Concluding Remarks) to the contemplated publication of the whole study in book form. We may add that Dr. Kirchner will be glad to hear from readers interested in the subject.

Parts I and II were published in our issues for February and October 1936. — E.d.

<sup>356</sup> p. 132; from J. M. Keynes.

<sup>357</sup> l.c., p. 306; from A. Hope (Hawkins), B. Harraden, 1899, J. MacCarthy, 1880, respectively.

<sup>358</sup> Th. Hardy, *Life's Little Ironies*, p. 282 (Tauchn.).

<sup>359</sup> T. 31.5.1935.

<sup>360</sup> MGW., 3.7.1936, p. 8, 2.

<sup>361</sup> ib.; 26.6.1936, p. 514.

<sup>362</sup> ib.; 31.7.1936, p. 83, 3.

<sup>363</sup> ib.; 7.8.1936, p. 109, 1.

<sup>364</sup> CF., February 1936, p. 19.

<sup>365</sup> T., 4.2.1936, p. 13.

<sup>366</sup> CF., February 1936, p. 7 (Sir Alfred Zimmern).

<sup>367</sup> TLS., 2.5.1936, p. 371.

*the basic fact that ...<sup>368</sup>; we are left with the sad reflection that ...<sup>369</sup>; nor is it considered desirable that the smaller European states ... should be left with the conviction that ...<sup>370</sup>; I want Isfahan... to be left with some of their past glories<sup>371</sup>; you were left with nothing but Whigs and Radicals<sup>372</sup>; (he) seems to have been left with no more than 3,000 or 4,000 men<sup>373</sup>; at the end of the War the Navy was left with a large surplus of officers<sup>374</sup>; ... Germany was left with very inconsiderable armaments<sup>375</sup>. Mr. F. and Mr. M. assure me that in all the above examples of the s.p.c., quoted at the beginning of this section, this inverted constr. might be used interchangeably.*

Examples b): *I will leave word with my porter to show you upstairs<sup>376</sup>; some novels leave with the reader nothing but a thrill<sup>377</sup>; \*I would like to leave with you the thought for the day that ...<sup>378</sup>. The passive constr. is also possible: word was left with the porter ...; the impression was left with me (Mr. F.; Mr. M.). Mr. M. would, however, prefer 'the i. was made on me'.*

A substitute constr. with an on-compl. is also used, though not so frequently: *\*perhaps we should correct the impression which Prof. R. tends to leave upon us by re-reading some of ...<sup>379</sup>; the impressions which this store may leave on the minds of our young citizens ...<sup>380</sup>; the impression he left on the mind was not one of mass ...<sup>381</sup>; this report leaves upon the reader's mind a striking ... picture of ...<sup>382</sup>; perhaps the strangest impression left on some readers of this book is...<sup>383</sup>; this is the most definite impression left on Dr. M.<sup>384</sup>. The on-compl. may have been suggested on the analogy of such constr. as 'to make, create, an impression on' (which Mr. M. would prefer anyhow), but cp. e.g.: *to leave (the goods) upon his hands<sup>385</sup>. A to-compl. is also sometimes used: \*to the unenlightened such an article as this one can leave only the impression that an author is a mere compiler<sup>386</sup>.**

A to-compl. is used in the phrase: *I leave it to you (K.); nothing was left to the retreating army but to ... (K.); to leave Mary to her fate (K.); \*I must leave you to Ensign S.<sup>387</sup>. This to-compl. would be preferred by both Mr. F. and Mr. M. to the for-compl. in the following sentence: Do you think that our disaster will leave the Atlantic for you?<sup>388</sup>. But they consider*

<sup>368</sup> T., 14.5.1936, p. 15, 6.

<sup>369</sup> T., 23.5.1936, p. 16, 1.

<sup>370</sup> MGW., 28.2.1936, p. 164.

<sup>371</sup> T., 30.1.1936, p. 16; article by Lady Ravensdale (daughter of the late Lord Curzon).

<sup>372</sup> H. G. Wells, *Mr. Britling sees it through*, p. 12 (Pop. Ed., 1919).

<sup>373</sup> MGW., 22.5.1936, p. 417, 2.

<sup>374</sup> T., 30.5.1936, p. 13, 3.

<sup>375</sup> T., 19.6.1936, p. 9, 1 (Mr. St. Baldwin).

<sup>376</sup> M. D. Berlitz, *Second Book for Teaching English*, 1920, p. 126.

<sup>377</sup> T., 15.5.1936, p. 22, 3.

<sup>378</sup> S. Lewis, *It Can't Happen Here*, p. 218.

<sup>379</sup> CF., December 1935, p. 403.

<sup>380</sup> T., 4.5.1936, p. 12, 1 (article of the firm of Selfridge & Co.).

<sup>381</sup> *Her Privates We*, 1930, p. 40.

<sup>382</sup> T., 23.7.1936, p. 17.

<sup>383</sup> MGW., 8.11.1935, p. 375.

<sup>384</sup> MGW., 24.12.1936, p. 509.

<sup>385</sup> from O. Goldsmith; (still current!)

<sup>386</sup> SR., 20.6.1936, p. 8, 2.

<sup>387</sup> S. Lewis, l.c., p. 346.

<sup>388</sup> H. G. Wells, *Mr. Britling*, p. 287.

the *for-compl.* possible in the following: the old era *left behind for us what* is in many ways the most representative and stimulating series of jazz tunes that has ever been put on wax<sup>389</sup>; (they) *leave full latitude for local initiative*<sup>390</sup>.

I should be inclined to speak of *Conversion of the Objects* in the still current phrase: *I leave you to it* = I wash my hands of it (Mr. F.); cp.: ... sneaked off and *left me to it*<sup>391</sup>; "Begob," said Rory to Bran, "we'll see a terrible fight between those two." And Bran *left them to it*<sup>392</sup>. (See 'to find', and Concluding Remarks.)

\* \* \*

**to owe.** Both J. and K. say that this verb requires a *to-compl.* in the sense of 'to be indebted for', 'to have, as received from a person': *we owe the discovery* of the prismatic spectrum *to Sir I. Newton*; *she owed it to him* that ...<sup>393</sup>; thousands *owe their livelihood to his invention* (K.). This holds true of modern English usage with the exception of those cases in which the direct object is a pronoun etc.; here the two non-p.o. constr. is used: *she owed her aunt everything*<sup>394</sup>; Pope, *who owed him much*<sup>395</sup>; Anderson *owes him still more*<sup>396</sup>. The old language admitted the two non-p.o. constr. generally: *thou ow'st the worme no silk*; the beast *no hide*<sup>397</sup>. This constr. is, of course, quite common in the meanings of 'to have to pay', and 'to cherish' (*to owe a person a grudge*), see P. and NED. sub 2a, 3a. According to J. and P. the p.p.c. is 'unidiomatic' or 'unusual'. This is not in accordance with the facts. P. himself gives no fewer than four examples: a supper *which was not really owed him*; an invalid ... *to whom attentions are owed*; *much is owed to the patience...*; *they* (the debts) *are owed to the inhabitants of* ...<sup>398</sup>. Further examples: we feel that a great *debt of gratitude is owed to the wisdom* which founded the B.B.C. in its present form<sup>399</sup>; the visitors used registered marks, which are supplied out of *money owed in Germany to foreigners*<sup>400</sup>; *\*something was felt to be owed to* ...<sup>401</sup>; *\*the debt American prose and the American language owe him is great, equalled, indeed, only by that owed him by Mr. Roosevelt*<sup>402</sup>. J. thinks that this constr. is 'unidiomatic' because "one usually says 'is due to', or 'is owing to' instead of 'is owed to'." <sup>403</sup> (Cp. e.g.: *the amount owing by Germany to Yugoslavia*<sup>404</sup>). Still there is room for the p.p.c. Both Mr. F. and Mr. M. confirm that the p.p.c. is 'quite possible,' though perhaps not too common.

<sup>389</sup> CF., February 1936, p. 14.

<sup>390</sup> Viscount D'Abernon, *An Ambassador of Peace*, Vol. I, 1929.

<sup>391</sup> H. G. Wells, *Christina Alberta's Father* (Tauchn.), p. 37.

<sup>392</sup> Lord Dunsany, *Rory and Bran*, 1936, p. 54.

<sup>393</sup> J., l.c., p. 294.

<sup>394</sup> P.; from Trollope.

<sup>395</sup> E. Legouis, *History of Engl. Liter.*, Vol. 1, 1926, p. 359.

<sup>396</sup> R. Michaud, *The American Novel Today*, 1928, p. 154; the French original says:

Anderson lui doit plus encore.

<sup>397</sup> NED. sub 4a; from Shakespeare, *King Lear*.

<sup>398</sup> from Th. Hardy, A. E. W. Mason, MG., and Westm. Gazette respectively.

<sup>399</sup> T., 7.7.1936, p. 9, 1; Major Tryon, Postmaster General, in the House of Commons.

<sup>400</sup> T., 26.8.1936, p. 11, 2.

<sup>401</sup> SR., 30.3.1929, p. 821.

<sup>402</sup> *The New Yorker*, 16.5.1936, p. 74, 1.

<sup>403</sup> l.c., p. 300.

<sup>404</sup> T., 20.3.1936, p. 13, 6. I might add more examples of this use; see also P. II, Section II, p. 521.



According to P. and J. the s.p.c. is 'rare'. This is not in accordance with the facts either. P. himself lists two examples of this constr., which he pronounces 'even more awkward' (sc. than the p.p.c.): *what he was owed; what she was owed* by Europe<sup>405</sup>, and J. adds four more examples: *what I am owed; you are owed some compensation; what you are owed* by mankind; France must get from Germany *what she is owed*<sup>406</sup>. Another example is registered by Kruisinga: saving a certain technical excellence, both they and their *works are owed only the scantiest reverence*<sup>407</sup>. I can add a few more: *I was owed* by these countries *sums* sufficient to support me for the rest of my days; the same occurred to the Germans *who were owed German money*, whether by foreigners or by other Germans<sup>408</sup>; in other countries *which are similarly owed large sums*<sup>409</sup>; \*... people *who were owed debts*<sup>410</sup>. These examples show that the s.p.c. is not so 'rare', after all.

\* \* \*

**to play.** According to P. a *to*-compl. 'is, perhaps, more frequent' in the combination '*she played her some waltzes*'. The reverse is true (Mr. M.; Mr. F.): *play me a tune* (K.); \**I play you one* of my adagio movements<sup>411</sup>. There is also a constr. with a *for*-compl.: the girl asked the musician *to play a tune for her* (Mr. F., Mr. M.). But whereas the two non-p.o. constr. is quite current in the literal sense, the s.p.c. is hardly used. In the combination 'to play one a trick' the two non-p.o. constr. was the only one current in England, according to Mr. F., perhaps a generation ago, or at least distinctly preferred to the *on*-dative (as to that, see Concluding Remarks). Individually, Mr. F. still prefers the two non-p.o. constr., although he admits that in general usage the *on*-dative has been gaining ground for the last ten years or so, and is now practically as common in England as the two non-p.o. constr. Examples: *my chum has played me a dirty* (shabby, mean) *trick* (K.; Kirkpatrick<sup>412</sup>); (he) attempted *to play me no tricks* whatever<sup>413</sup>; (they) would ... intreat me not *to play them any trick*<sup>414</sup>. The NED. has earlier examples (sub 9a). The s.p.c. 'I was played a dirty trick' is also possible (Mr. F.). Mr. M. says that in America the *on*-dative is decidedly preferred: *he played a trick (up)on me*; this constr. is mentioned by the NED (sub 9a), but no quotation is given. Example: \*I still remember the time I was at college and the many *tricks I used to play on my teacher*<sup>415</sup>. Americans would often prefer to say, however, \*'never do a *friend a dirty trick*'<sup>416</sup>. Further examples of the *with*-compl. mentioned by P.: *she never juggles or plays*

<sup>405</sup> from Temple Thurston, and MG. respectively.

<sup>406</sup> l.c., p. 307; from Th. Hardy, Harraden, Campbell, and a newspaper respectively.

<sup>407</sup> *A Handbook of Present-Day English* (4th Ed.), § 274; from J. Stephens in *Eng. Review*, April 1914.

<sup>408</sup> G. B. Shaw, *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism*, 1929, p. 255.

<sup>409</sup> T., 12.3.1936, p. 13.

<sup>410</sup> Sc., p. 233.

<sup>411</sup> J., l.c., p. 283; from O. W. Holmes.

<sup>412</sup> *Handbook of Idiomatic English*.

<sup>413</sup> *Memoirs of Th. Holcroft* (The World's Classics), p. 32.

<sup>414</sup> ib., p. 50.

<sup>415</sup> M. D. Berlitz, *Second Book for Teaching English*, 135th Ed., 1920, p. 50.

<sup>416</sup> G. J. Nathan; in TLS. 12.2.1931, p. 112.

tricks with her understanding<sup>417</sup>; fate played a strange trick with D.<sup>418</sup>; the season allows no tricks to be played with it<sup>419</sup>; A. Daly, the American manager, played all sorts of tricks with *The Taming of the Shrew* ...<sup>420</sup>. This constr. is pronounced 'possible' by both Mr. F. and Mr. M.

It is difficult to decide whether we have to take 'false', and 'fair' as adverbs or noun-equivalents in the case of 'to play a person false, fair'. The NED. has a few examples: (he) has plaid us false<sup>421</sup>; appearances might play them false<sup>422</sup>; if my memory does not play me false<sup>423</sup>; if they play him fair<sup>424</sup>; there is also a constr. with *with*: you play false with us, madam<sup>425</sup>. J. has decided to take it as an adverb: 'false is hardly an object'<sup>426</sup>. But cp. such expressions as 'to go a person one better', 'to speak a person fair', 'to wish a person well', and what has been said about the matter under these titles. Cp. also 'to run a person close'.

**to pour.** This verb is occasionally used in America (perhaps also in England) in the meaning of 'to pour out', and admits of the two non-p.o. constr.: \*he said he would *pour himself a drink*<sup>427</sup>; \*she *poured herself another highball*<sup>428</sup>. Mr. F. does not know this constr.; but I think I have heard it used in a talk from some British broadcasting station.

**to pour out.** The two non-p.o. constr. is quite current (Mr. F.; Mr. M.). Examples: shall I *pour your honour out a glass* of sack to your pipe?<sup>429</sup>. *Pour yourself out a cup of tea* (K.); would you mind *pouring me out a glass* of water?<sup>430</sup>; I say, *pour me out a cup of tea*, Kate ...<sup>431</sup>. P. is mistaken in thinking that the alternative constr. with *for* has a slightly different meaning (cp. 'to fill'). It may have that meaning (hardly in America), but not necessarily. On the contrary, the usual connotation of the constr. with the *for*-compl. would seem to be one of a dative function, but slightly more formal. Cp. the following quotations from Lord Dunsany: *I poured out a glass for Dean Spanley*; *I poured out for him more Tokay*. (He) *looked at the glass that I had poured out for him*<sup>432</sup>. The following two examples are somewhat different: I'd almost rather not drink it than *pour it out for myself*; *it was poured out for him*<sup>433</sup>. In the former the *for*-constr. could hardly be avoided; in the latter it is generally preferred to the two non-p.o. constr. K. gives the following two constructions as interchangeable: the monkey *poured out a cup of milk for herself* = *poured herself out a cup of milk*. A third alternative is provided by the following

<sup>417</sup> Ch. Lamb, *Essays of Elia*, London 1885, p. 61 ('Mackery End in H.').

<sup>418</sup> E. Salmon, *The Literature and Art of the Empire*, 1924, p. 221.

<sup>419</sup> I cannot tell where I found this sentence.

<sup>420</sup> T., 22.1.1937, p. 17, 4.

<sup>421</sup> sub 18b; from Otway, 1680.

<sup>422</sup> ib.; from TW. 1884.

<sup>423</sup> ib.; 1893.

<sup>424</sup> ib. sub 18a; from Mrs. Gaskell, 1866.

<sup>425</sup> ib. sub 18b; from Sheridan, 1775.

<sup>426</sup> l.c., p. 282.

<sup>427</sup> CF., December 1935, p. 396.

<sup>428</sup> R. W. Lardner, *The Love Nest*; in *The Albatross Book of American Short Stories*, 1935, p. 292.

<sup>429</sup> from L. Sterne; Herrig-Förster, *British Classical Authors*, p. 230.

<sup>430</sup> L. Hamilton, *Handbook of Engl. and German Conversation*, 1935, p. 98.

<sup>431</sup> H. de Sélincourt, *The Cricket Match*, 1924, p. 25 (courtesy of the Ed., E. St.).

<sup>432</sup> *My Talks with Dean Spanley*, 1936, pp. 6, 51, 71. In all these three examples the two non-p.o. constr. would be admissible or used in the spoken language.

<sup>433</sup> H. de Sélincourt, l.c., pp. 25, 29. (courtesy of the Ed., E. St.)

quotation: she liked to *pour out young Mr. Edgar's tea*. He was always the perfect gentleman<sup>434</sup>. The Saxon genitive can take the place of the direct object with this and similar verbs.

**to provide.** Both Mr. F. and Mr. M. think the two non-p.o. constr. is 'old-fashioned' and little used to-day. The NED. has a first example from 1581: *provide me ynke and paper*<sup>435</sup>; the latest is dated 1898: *the contractors ... do honestly provide the convicts the rations* prescribed by the Government<sup>436</sup>. It may have been kept alive by Biblical usage: *provide me now a man that can play well*<sup>437</sup>; *thou providest them corn*<sup>438</sup>. Whereas Wy. and R. do not mention the two non-p.o. constr., K. still construes: *I can provide you a valuable travelling-companion; I have provided you seats* in the first row; but: *I have provided them with food and clothes*. Mr. F. says that even the proverbial 'take the good the gods provide you' is nowadays but rarely used; Mr. M. does not know this proverb. But it seems that the two non-p.o. constr. is still used to-day in America, though in literary style only: \**(they) had provided him transportation money*<sup>439</sup>; \*both Dunbar and Chesnutt ... *provide us plenty of illustrations* of the devotion and loyalty of slaves to masters<sup>440</sup>; \*the most beautiful works of literature are those which ... attain ... an extensive application to the lives of readers — *providing them* thereby aims which give purpose and direction to their activities<sup>441</sup>. Example of the p.p.c.: \**an interesting exercise is provided the better-informed readers*<sup>442</sup>. According to Mr. M. the s.p.c. is also possible; he would prefer a constr. with a *with*-compl. though.

The alternative constr. with a *for*-compl. is pronounced 'quite common' by P., and rightly so in my opinion. Both Mr. F. and Mr. M. say, however, that they would prefer the *with*-compl., which, according to them, is the only constr. really current to-day. Nevertheless examples abound, and Wy. also construes: *to provide a horse for a friend*. Further examples: ... products which bountiful Nature *has provided for them* (K.); she *provided for this woman a meal* consisting of ...<sup>443</sup>; lack of calcium ... in the *fare we provide for them*<sup>444</sup>; *(they) provided seating for thousands of spectators*<sup>445</sup>; ... *no beer is provided for the servants*<sup>446</sup>; ... some games *to provide exercise for your children* and entertainment for friends<sup>447</sup>;

<sup>434</sup> H. de Sélincourt, l.c., p. 25, (courtesy of the Ed., E. St.).

<sup>435</sup> sub 5.

<sup>436</sup> ib.; from Besant.

<sup>437</sup> K. *Synonymik*, p. 108.

<sup>438</sup> NED. sub 'prepare' v. 4; *Revised Version*, 1885.

<sup>439</sup> V. L. Parrington, *Main Currents in American Thought*, Vol. III, p. 396.

<sup>440</sup> R. C. Barton, *Race Consciousness and Amer. Negro Liter.*, Greifswald 1934, p. 75.

<sup>441</sup> M. F. Brightfield, *The Issue in Literary Criticism*, University of California Press, 1932, p. 159. This quotation, for which I am indebted to the Ed. (E. St.), is selected by L. Cazamian, the reviewer of this book in the August issue of *Revue Anglo-Américaine*, 1936, p. 534, and rendered the more interesting for our purposes by the reviewer's interpolation of the preposition (*with*?) in italics. We have to conclude that the two non-p.o. constr. after 'provide' sounded unfamiliar to the reviewer.

<sup>442</sup> NYT., 26.12.1926, p. 13.

<sup>443</sup> T., 28.2.1936, p. 4; Mr. Justice Goddard, summing up (law report).

<sup>444</sup> MGW., 29.5.1936, p. 428.

<sup>445</sup> ib.; 19.6.1936, p. 489, 4.

<sup>446</sup> E. Foster Brown, *Everyday Life in England* (Teubner) 1935, p. 26.

<sup>447</sup> T., 23.6.1936, p. 11 (advertisement).



... to provide opiates for millions who ...<sup>448</sup>. The alternative constr. with a *to*-compl. is considered 'obsolete' by the NED., which registers an example from 1538: *Al thyng that God and nature hath prouydyd to hym*<sup>449</sup>. If it has ever been 'obsolete', this constr. seems to have lately been reintroduced: there has been the task of *providing direct home relief to some 10,000,000 cases*<sup>450</sup>; *a stone gateway ... provided a formal entry to the precinct*<sup>451</sup>; if the arrangement goes through *it will provide an important ... stimulus to the French export industries*<sup>452</sup>. These sentences might be interpreted as examples of a simple object constr., the preposition *to* being conditioned by the respective substantives. But such an unambiguous example as the following proves the constr. to exist: *all will welcome the recent schemes for providing milk to school-children*<sup>453</sup>. There are also obsolete constr. with *in* (cp. to furnish, find, keep), and with *of* (cp. to feed, furnish). For examples see the NED.

\* \* \*

**to save.** The two non-p.o. constr. is current, both in England and America (Mr. F., Mr. M.) in the three meanings of a) 'to store', 'reserve', 'preserve' (material sense), b) 'to gain the advantage', 'to avoid spending', and c) 'to preserve from'.

Examples of a): *I have saved you a few apples* (K.). Instead of the s.p.c. a substitute constr. would be used: *three persons had their lives saved*<sup>454</sup>. A *for*-compl. is used as often: *I have saved a few apples for you* (K.; Mr. F.; Mr. M.). The use of the *to*-compl. is rare: *you have already saved several millions to the publick*<sup>455</sup>; *his commission was saved to him* only by the intervention of ...<sup>456</sup>. Mr. F. says he would in this sentence either use the two non-p.o. constr., or a *for*-compl.

Examples of b) (cp. also 'to spare'): *The Baltic Canal saves the ship eight days*<sup>457</sup>; *thou hast saued me a thousand markes in linkes and torches*<sup>458</sup>; *he saved me a steward*<sup>459</sup>. The two non-p.o. constr. is still current; a *to*-compl. seems out of the question (Mr. F.; Mr. M.). The s.p.c. is possible: *patients could thus be saved long and expensive journeys* (K.).

Examples of c): *it saves me a deal of trouble*<sup>460</sup>; *the woodpecker saves the tree much damage* (K.); *\*it would save those people a world of uncomfortable shuffling*<sup>461</sup>; *if you want to save them a long stretch of penal servitude*<sup>462</sup>; *you can save yourself a great deal of bewilderment*<sup>463</sup>;

<sup>448</sup> MGW., 26.6.1936, p. 503, 3.

<sup>449</sup> sub. 5.

<sup>450</sup> T., 21.2.1936, p. 15, 6; article by Mr. Ronald Davison on 'Relief in the U.S.A.'.

<sup>451</sup> T., 28.2.1936, p. 18, 1; article by Dr. R. E. M. Wheeler on the excavations at Maiden Castle.

<sup>452</sup> T., 8.1.1936, p. 9, 5.

<sup>453</sup> letter to the T., 15.6.1936, p. 8, 3.

<sup>454</sup> MGW., 10.5.1929, p. II.

<sup>455</sup> NED. sub 18; from Swift, 1712.

<sup>456</sup> letter to the T., 3.11.1934, p. 13.

<sup>457</sup> K., *Synonymik*, p. 637.

<sup>458</sup> NED. sub 18; from Shakespeare, 1596.

<sup>459</sup> P.; from Thackeray.

<sup>460</sup> J., l.c., p. 294.

<sup>461</sup> SR., 12.10.1935, p. 4, 1; from M. Twain.

<sup>462</sup> J., l.c., p. 283; from St. Mc Kenna.

<sup>463</sup> R. E. Mitchell, *America*, 1935, p. 89.

... to save other people the bother of ...<sup>464</sup>; the cinema ... saves us the trouble of forming mental pictures of our heroes and heroines<sup>465</sup>.

P. says that the p.p.c. 'appears to be less usual than the s.p.c.'; this is in accordance with the facts (see also 'to spare'); he gives two examples of the p.p.c. which are rendered especially interesting by the fact that a *to*-compl. is used: *half Prague's troubles ... might have been saved to it; all this ... labour would be saved to them*<sup>466</sup>. J., at any rate, quotes Onions to the effect that the *to*-phrase 'is hardly ever found'<sup>467</sup> (obviously in our meaning c). This seems quite true; both Mr. M. and Mr. F. think that the above sentences with the *to*-compl. sound 'unnatural'; perhaps the constr. is part of the comic effect intended by the author. The third example of the p.p.c. given by P., in which the *to*-compl. is dispensed with, is recognised by Mr. F. as quite correct: *what years of suffering and exile might have been saved your father*<sup>468</sup>; another example of the p.p.c. is given by J.: *this terrible ordeal would have been saved me*<sup>469</sup>. The s.p.c. is quite current (Mr. M.; Mr. F.). P. has an early example from J. Austen: *she was saved the trouble of checking it*<sup>470</sup>. Modern examples: *I should be saved much agony* (K.); *we've been saved that*<sup>471</sup>; \**who knows what the world might have been saved?*<sup>472</sup>.

P. thinks that the verb 'mostly takes *from* before the (pro)noun denoting what is regarded as an evil, a punishment, or inconvenience' (cp. 'to spare'). He gives but one example from Dickens: *he saved me from the embarrassment ...* Although quite a number of examples with a *from*-compl. might be easily collected [cp.: *he saved me from much interruption* and many annoying questions<sup>473</sup>; *I wish to save my relations (from) inconvenience* (K.); Johnson was glad to be saved from a task that had no attraction for him (K.); *the English system saves the creative artist from the worst impertinences* of some Jack-in-office ...<sup>474</sup>; \**(the great author) is saved from an infinity of errors* by that fine sense of expression ...<sup>475</sup> etc.] I cannot accept the view that a *from*-compl. is 'mostly' taken; it may be as frequent as the two non-p.o. constr. (Mr. F.), although I should even be inclined to say with Mr. M. that the latter constr. is more frequent. Cp. also: *A few words from you might perhaps save me much groping* ...<sup>476</sup>. The *from*-compl. seems to me to be slightly more literary, or equivalent to the meaning of 'to preserve, rescue from' (in German: 'jemand vor etwas bewahren'), which is shown in such phrases as 'to save a person from the fire', 'save me from my friends' etc.

**to secure.** This verb offers a good illustration of the inadequacy of the dictionaries as regards the two non-p.o. constr. Under the heading 'to

<sup>464</sup> T., 1.6.1936, p. 11, 2.

<sup>465</sup> T., 30.5.1936, p. 10, 1.

<sup>466</sup> from Jerome, *Three Men on the Bummel*.

<sup>467</sup> l.c., p. 294.

<sup>468</sup> Part II, Section II, p. 133; from Lytton.

<sup>469</sup> l.c., p. 302; from Hardy.

<sup>470</sup> *Sense and Sensibility*.

<sup>471</sup> G. Moore, *The Untilled Field* (Tauchn.).

<sup>472</sup> SR., 25.5.1929, p. 1051.

<sup>473</sup> NED., sub 5; 1827.

<sup>474</sup> MGW., 24.4.1936, p. 323.

<sup>475</sup> Lounsbury, *The Standard of Usage in English*, 1908, p. 104.

<sup>476</sup> Carlyle, letter to Goethe, 20.3.1830.

ensure (a person's) obtaining (something)' the NED. (sub 31) registers a single example with the verb in the passive voice (s.p.c.) from Scott, which is duly taken over by P., and goes to the length of pronouncing this constr. 'rare'. P. in his turn lists a modern example of the two non-p.o. constr., says it 'appears to be unusual', and pronounces the constr. with *to* or *for* 'the ordinary constr.'. (His one example of the *to*-compl. is taken from Addison). Wy. and R. do not mention the two non-p.o. constr., nor is there an entry in the Supplement of the NED. But this very constr. is current in every-day use, both in England and America (Mr. F.; Mr. M.), in the meanings of 'to assure, ensure, obtain (possession of)'. I quote first K.'s examples (all testified to as quite current by both Mr. F. and Mr. M.): *these qualities should secure the book a large circulation; will you secure me a room somewhere? the influence of his friends secured him his freedom; I think I have secured the ladies a good place; money secures its owner independence. Further examples: the duke secured the bagman a lucrative situation*<sup>477</sup>; Lady A. tells me to request you to secure her a set of stables<sup>478</sup>; to secure him the utmost peace and quietness<sup>479</sup>; being now anxious to secure himself an engagement<sup>480</sup>; (they) engaged a lawyer to secure them what they regarded as a just division<sup>481</sup>; (he has) secured them a good income<sup>482</sup>; the queen's influence secured him two beneficial leases<sup>483</sup> etc. K. mistakenly thinks that the reflexive pronoun is commonly dispensed with: secure a seat beforehand<sup>484</sup>; but Mr. F. and Mr. M. assure me that the pronoun is as frequent: *secure yourself a seat* (see also the above example from Hazlitt).

The *to*-compl. is rarely used to-day, according to Mr. F.; but cp. the following modern example: on most estates the public enjoys privileges *which are not secured to it* by strict law<sup>485</sup>. The *for*-compl. seems as common as the two non-p.o. constr. P. thinks that the s.p.c. is impossible; but there is the above example of the NED. from Scott, and he himself gives two more instances: ... *if he were secured solitude and freedom from interruption; the labourer must be secured a real living wage*<sup>486</sup>. Far from being 'exceptional', the s.p.c. is quite common (Mr. F., Mr. M.).

**to spare.** P. says there is 'a difficulty in discriminating between the various shades of meaning of this verb'. But we can considerably reduce this difficulty by differentiating between three chief meanings, all admitting the two non-p.o. constr.: a) 'to avoid spending' (cp. 'to save'): she could *spare herself the expense* of a master<sup>487</sup>; b) 'to give, grant, afford' (in German: 'erübrigen'), and c): 'to save, preserve from', (in German: 'ersparen'), the implication being mostly 'from some inconvenience'. See

<sup>477</sup> Grund-Schwabe, *Erweiterte Grammatik*, p. 202.

<sup>478</sup> I cannot find a source among my notes.

<sup>479</sup> MGW., 8.2.1929, p. 116.

<sup>480</sup> W. Hazlitt in *Memoirs of Th. Holcroft* (The World's Classics), p. 77.

<sup>481</sup> J. W. Gregory, *The Menace of Colour*, 1925, p. 68.

<sup>482</sup> Kirkpatrick, *Handbook of Idiomatic English*, p. 177 (sub 'provide').

<sup>483</sup> *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th Ed., Vol. 22, p. 869; article on Sir W. Raleigh

by D. H.

<sup>484</sup> *Synonymik*, p. 628.

<sup>485</sup> MGW., 30.10.1936, p. 341.

<sup>486</sup> *Part II, Section II*, p. 132.

<sup>487</sup> Thackeray, *Vanity Fair*, Ch. II



also 'to save'. For a fourth meaning, not admitting the two non-p.o. constr., see the end of this section.

Examples of b): *could you spare me a pound or two?* (K.); *I hope you will spare me time* some day and write in return (K.); *can you spare me a dance?* (P.); *you could not spare us space* to deal with all the misrepresentations...<sup>488</sup>. The NED. has a few examples of this use from Shakespeare onwards (sub 9a). The *for*-compl. is, according to Mr. F., as frequent: *Can you spare a copper for a poor man, sir?* P. says that the *to*-compl., which may be connected with the verb in this application, is 'comparatively unusual'. This is confirmed by both Mr. F. and Mr. M. When J. says (obviously under the influence of Onions) that the *to*-phrase is 'hardly ever found'<sup>489</sup> he seems to refer to our meaning c) only. Still, P. can quote one modern example: *I am not too proud to take anything you can spare to us*<sup>490</sup>. Judging from my own examples I should like to say that it seems often used to-day in the combination 'to spare a thought': *the wireless listener may spare a grateful thought* this week *to the International Broadcasting Union*<sup>491</sup>; (the late King) would surely have approved the notion that *the youth of the country should* henceforth pass to their play through 'King George's Gates', and *spare a thought to the friend* and well-wisher whose name they bear<sup>492</sup>; in days of intense activity in publishing, ... it is good *to spare a thought to the merits* of continuity and tradition<sup>493</sup>; cp. also: Mr. Baldwin ... was right in his advice, but he might ... have *spared a moment* or two *to presenting* his reasons for it<sup>494</sup>. But even here a *for*-compl. is occasionally used: here and there a Yuletide guest, as he rises, will *spare* a fleeting, vengeful *thought for the* anonymous *author* of the cracker-mottoes which have rounded off with exquisite banality the seasonal festivities<sup>495</sup>. (Note that rhythmical as well as stylistic considerations seem to necessitate the *to*-compl. in these cases, the indirect object being either a long compound or weighted by an additional clause).

As to the p.c., P. says that 'both p.c. are in actual use, but the p.p.c. is more or less unusual'. But he seems to refer to our meaning c), since he gives no examples whatever of meaning b). Actually, both Mr. F. and Mr. M. declare that in this meaning the p.p.c. is 'unusual'. The s.p.c. is used, according to Mr. F.: *I was spared a few minutes*. Mr. M. says, however, that it is not used either.

Examples of c): *spare my sight the pain* of seeing...<sup>496</sup>; *I might spare myself the trouble*<sup>497</sup>; *I might spare myself the pains to show*.<sup>498</sup>; *spare me the necessity* of mentioning ...<sup>499</sup>. There are some more examples in the NED. Modern ones: *I want to spare you all the suffering..., the humiliation of ..., the tedium of ...* (Wy.); *we should spare the lower*

<sup>488</sup> T., 25.2.1936, p. 15, 5.

<sup>489</sup> l.c., p. 294.

<sup>490</sup> from Trollope.

<sup>491</sup> T., 6.4.1935, p. 13.

<sup>492</sup> T., 16.5.1936, p. 15, 2 (leader).

<sup>493</sup> T., 9.6.1936, p. 15, 3; leader on 'Publishers in Conference'.

<sup>494</sup> MGW., 18.12.1936, p. 484, 4.

<sup>495</sup> T., 23.11.1936, p. 13, 4.

<sup>496</sup> NED. sub 9c; from Dryden, 1681.

<sup>497</sup> ib.; from Lady M. W. Montagu, 1717.

<sup>498</sup> ib.; from Cowper, 1781.

<sup>499</sup> ib.; from Mrs. Radcliffe, 1794.

creatures also useless pain (K.); you might have spared your composers all this worry (K.); ... to spare the German nation a *Kulturkampf*<sup>500</sup>; \*he has apparently spared himself no pains in ...<sup>501</sup>; \*S. had once been glad that L. spared her any mothering<sup>502</sup>; the radio ... spares us the effort of travel to broaden our minds<sup>503</sup>. In this application the verb may also be occasionally connected with a *to*-compl., and again P. rightly says that it is 'comparatively unusual' (cp. the statement of Onions and J., mentioned above). He gives two examples, one from Scott, the other from Thackeray. Three more (again, two of P.'s own) will be found below, among the examples of the p.p.c.

As has been said above, P. states that 'both p.c. are in actual use, but the p.p.c. is more or less unusual'. He gives only one example of the p.p.c.: *that danger ... is spared our brother*<sup>504</sup>. We must turn to another chapter of his grammar for a few more examples: *what a world of suffering might have been spared me!*<sup>505</sup>; *all this pain might have been spared to both of us*<sup>506</sup>; *many a sad pang would have been spared to him*<sup>507</sup>. It might be concluded from these examples as they stand that the p.p.c. could not be so 'unusual' after all. What strikes both Mr. F. and Mr. M. as unusual is the use of the *to*-compl. in the respective sentences. Otherwise they consider e.g. the above 'what a world of suffering *might have been spared me*' quite correct and idiomatic. Further modern examples of the p.p.c.: *that humiliation was spared (to) him*<sup>508</sup>; *the ordinary troubles of life seem to have been spared him* (K.); \*to suppose that *the Karma is to be spared us*<sup>509</sup>; *a catastrophe which must be spared the present and coming generations*<sup>510</sup>; *that this knowledge might be spared him*<sup>511</sup>. In view of all these examples the contention can no longer be upheld that the p.p.c. is 'more or less unusual.' Besides it is expressly refuted by both Mr. F. and Mr. M. What is strange under these circumstances is the verdict of Onions (quoted by P.) that such a sentence as '*the trouble was spared me*' is 'hardly English'<sup>512</sup>. It is 'correct' English, according to both Mr. M. and Mr. F. It seems, then, that P. is influenced by Onions, just as e.g. Kruisinga is apparently, when he says: "it is very rare for verbs with two objects in the active to make the indirect (personal) object into the subject of a passive constr. to the practical exclusion of the direct object"<sup>513</sup>. Such a verb is 'to spare'<sup>514</sup>. It is time that the statement of Onions should be rectified.

The s.p.c. is acknowledged by Onions as 'quite natural' (his example: *I was spared the trouble*). (P. has not a single example of the s.p.c. in

<sup>500</sup> T., 28.1.1936, p. 9.

<sup>501</sup> SR., 17.10.1931, p. 206.

<sup>502</sup> S. Lewis, *If Can't Happen Here*, p. 394.

<sup>503</sup> T., 30.5.36, p. 10, 1.

<sup>504</sup> from Thackeray, *Vanity Fair*.

<sup>505</sup> Part II, Section II, p. 134; from Th. Watts-Dunton, *Aylwin*.

<sup>506</sup> ib.; from Thackeray, *Virginians*.

<sup>507</sup> ib.; from W. Gunnyon, *Biogr. Sketch of Burns*.

<sup>508</sup> K., *Synonymik*, p. 637.

<sup>509</sup> SR., 18.3.1933, p. 486; H. S. Canby.

<sup>510</sup> MGW., 22.3.1935, p. 227; translation from the German.

<sup>511</sup> J. M. Barrie, *Peter Pan*, p. 275.

<sup>512</sup> P., Part II, Section II, p. 127.

<sup>513</sup> italics mine!

<sup>514</sup> *A Handbook of Present-Day English*, 4th Ed., § 276.

his list). There is also a modern example in the NED.: *I was, however, spared this infliction*<sup>515</sup>. K.'s examples: *I was spared the horrible rite; the mother was not spared (from) the deepest grief; may you be spared this!* he regarded life as a nuisance *which he gladly would have been spared*; the nobles took care that *Mary should not be spared the knowledge* of her husband's treachery; *you would have been spared a humiliation*. J. gives, among more recent examples, an earlier one from J. Austen: *you have been spared something* of these distressing scenes<sup>516</sup>.

As in the case of 'to save' there is also an alternative constr. with a thing-compl. with *from* (in German: 'bewahren vor'), which, as seems implied in P., is more usual than the constr. with a *to*-compl. (He does not say that the *from*-compl. is 'mostly' taken to denote 'what is regarded as an evil, a punishment or inconvenience', as in the case of 'to save'). P. gives three examples: *it would have spared her from explanations* and professions ...<sup>517</sup>; *spare my boy from knowledge* of this man<sup>518</sup>; ... *to spare me from this*<sup>519</sup>. I have reprinted a great many examples of meaning c) just to show that this alternative constr. with *from* is not so often used to-day. There is only a single example among K.'s instances of the s.p.c. I came across two more examples recently: (the turtle) was presented by Messrs. ..., who *spared it from the fate* of being converted into soup on account of its size<sup>520</sup> (cp. the following sentence, in which the same meaning is rendered by the two non-p.o. constr.: our hearts gave thanks to God that He had *spared us and our children the horror* of capture by the Communist armies<sup>521</sup>); in order to *spare those English scholars* who have been forced into a precarious situation *from the necessity* of perhaps an uncomfortable decision, I hereby retract the invitation<sup>522</sup>.

In the meaning of 'to preserve', now set apart for the higher literary style, (in German 'erhalten') a *to*-compl. is used alongside of *for*. K. has one example, which would seem to postulate the two non-p.o. constr.: 'it is cause for thankfulness that *your father was spared (to) you* so long.' But since both Mr. F. and Mr. M. insist that either a *to*-compl. should be used (Mr. M.), or that the indirect object should be dispensed with ('... that your father was spared'; Mr. F.) we may suppose the two non-p.o. constr. to be merely a mistake on the part of K., considering that no further examples have come to hand. The passive constr. seems more frequent to-day than the active one: \**God had spared him to me*<sup>523</sup>. Whereas Mr. M. still recognises this sentence as correct, Mr. F. says he would use a *for*-compl. Modern example of the p.p.c.: *Cromwell was spared to his*

<sup>515</sup> sub 9c; 1893.

<sup>516</sup> l.c., p. 307; from *Pride and Prejudice*.

<sup>517</sup> from J. Austen.

<sup>518</sup> from Dickens.

<sup>519</sup> from Trollope.

<sup>520</sup> T., 14.11.1936, p. 9.

<sup>521</sup> T., 3.4.1936, p. 18, 1.

<sup>522</sup> T., 3.3.1936, p. 16, 2. [This is a translation (from the German), which is blamed generally by Prof. W. E. Collinson, Liverpool, in a subsequent letter to the T. as producing 'an impression of curtness and coldness hardly warranted by the wording of the original'. Although Prof. C. does not find fault with the constr. in question, it may contribute to heightening the intended effect, even if called for by the 'time-lag' between direct and indirect object.]

<sup>523</sup> *The Autobiography of America*, ed. by M. van Doren, 1930, p. 124; early American text.



people<sup>524</sup>. There is another example in P. which belongs here: *long may the survivors be spared to the country*<sup>525</sup>. These sentences convey a dignified and solemn connotation.

**to stint.** I find Muret-Sanders construing 'to stint oneself the necessities of life', and was almost inclined to consider this a misprint or mistake of some sort, since not a single example illustrating this use of the two non-p.o. constr. was forthcoming. There were, of course, such quotations as the following in the NED.: *stint not to truth the flow of wit ...*<sup>526</sup>; *I cannot stint that name to one*<sup>527</sup>, from which a two non-p.o. constr. might be postulated for the spoken language. But I make it a rule to refrain from admitting those verbs with which the two non-p.o. constr. could only be postulated, and is not expressly confirmed either by quotations or by the evidence of either Mr. F. or Mr. M. Otherwise my list might have been increased considerably. As it was, all the available authorities were unanimous in denying the existence of the two non-p.o. constr. The NED. knows only the modern constr. with an *of*-compl. (alongside of *in*; see below), the first example of which dates from 1794, though: *the horse ... has been stinted of his oats ever since*<sup>528</sup>. Further examples: ... *(they) stinted themselves of necessary things*<sup>529</sup>; *he had been compelled to stint his family of even common necessities*<sup>530</sup>. Examples of an *in*-compl., which is quite common in England, according to Mr. F., whereas Mr. M., is 'not certain about this use': we ought to *stint ourselves in our most lawful satisfactions*<sup>531</sup>; *they stint themselves in their meals*<sup>532</sup>. K. construes only 'to stint a person in a thing': at Christmas even *the faithful do not stint themselves in refreshments* (good fare)<sup>533</sup>. (From this *in*-compl., which seems typical of certain verbs of 'supplying' or 'giving', the two non-p.o. constr. might also have been postulated indirectly, as 'to stint' is a 'negative' verb of this group). Mr. M. is equally positive that the two non-p.o. constr. does not exist. To my great surprise, then, Mr. F. answered my tentative enquiry in the affirmative, and confirmed the existence of this half-postulated constr. for England, thus proving the example of Muret-Sanders to be correct after all. Of course Mr. F. and Mr. M. also recognise the constr. with the *of*-compl.

**to supply.** As a synonym of 'to furnish' this verb might have been expected to show a similar diversity of constr. Actually I was hard pressed for an example of the two non-p.o. constr., which is not registered by the NED. At last I hunted one out in K.: *you must supply (me) the dates and names*<sup>534</sup>, and the Editor (E.St.) kindly supplied another: *\*it has been suggested also that the first edition of Lear rests upon copy supplied the publisher to forestall the appearance of a stolen and garbled version*<sup>535</sup>.

<sup>524</sup> H. E. Lewington, *Called by Providence* (Teubner), p. 37.

<sup>525</sup> *Daily Mail*.

<sup>526</sup> sub 11a; from Gay, 1727.

<sup>527</sup> ib.; from Cowper, 1781.

<sup>528</sup> ib. sub 15a.

<sup>529</sup> ib.; 1850.

<sup>530</sup> M. D. Berlitz, *Second Book for Teaching English*, 1920, p. 130.

<sup>531</sup> NED. sub 14a; from Addison, 1710.

<sup>532</sup> ib. sub 15a; 1885—86.

<sup>533</sup> Vol. III, 1917, § 3809g, p. 1994.

<sup>534</sup> *Synonymik*, p. 779.

<sup>535</sup> Parrott, *W. Shakespeare*, New York 1934, p. 60.

Mr. F. says the two non-p.o. constr. is very rare; Mr. M. thinks it is 'possible'. Examples of the s.p.c. have so far not come to hand. But Mr. M. assures me that it is possible; it would not be out of the common to find the following: *I was supplied material*. Mr. F. says it is not used.

The to-compl., on the other hand, seems quite current, both in England and America (Mr. F.; Mr. M.). K. construes 'to supply a thing to a person or thing' (alongside of 'to supply a person or thing with a thing')<sup>536</sup>. Kirkpatrick also construes: *this merchant supplies* (sells) *goods to the army, to the navy, & supplies* (provides) *the army with goods*<sup>537</sup>. Further examples: *the gathering of these plants supplies a scanty livelihood to the poor people*<sup>538</sup>; *Nearer Care ... supplies Sighs to my Breast, and Sorrow to my Eyes*<sup>539</sup>; *half a dozen of these (corks) will supply handles to most tubes*<sup>540</sup>; *relay exchanges, which select broadcast programmes and supply them through land-lines to subscribers*<sup>541</sup>; *(they) supplied the background to the new ... crisis*<sup>542</sup>; *(they) supply food to friends*<sup>543</sup>; *to supply easy finance to small businesses*<sup>544</sup>. Examples of the p.p.c.: *medical services are freely supplied to those on the relief lists*<sup>545</sup>; *the amount of British oil supplied to the belligerents had dropped*<sup>546</sup>; *the faulty material that had been supplied to them*<sup>547</sup>; *an explanation was supplied to him*<sup>548</sup>; *the pens supplied to the post office*<sup>549</sup>.

A for-compl. may also be used (Mr. F.): *this well supplies water for the fountains*<sup>550</sup>; \* (he) *supplied a phrase for F. D. Roosevelt*<sup>551</sup>; *federal relief ... was started ... to supply for the entire community services that could not be offered by private enterprise*<sup>552</sup>.

The commonest constr., however, both in England and America (Mr. F.; Mr. M.) is that with a with-compl., of which the NED. registers many examples from the time of Shakespeare onwards: *keepe the chaires of Justice supplied with worthy men*<sup>553</sup>; *who supplies him with money? I would gladly supply you out of my own store with the numbers that you want*<sup>554</sup>.

\* \* \*

**to take.** The NED. registers the two non-p.o. constr., acknowledging it expressly as such, so far as I can see only in the two meanings of a) 'to strike', b) 'to give, hand over, deliver'.

<sup>536</sup> Vol. III, § 3809m; p. 1998.

<sup>537</sup> *Handbook of Idiomatic English*, sub 'supply'.

<sup>538</sup> K., *Synonymik*, p. 7/4.

<sup>539</sup> NED. sub 6a; from Prior, 1704.

<sup>540</sup> ib.; from Faraday, 1827.

<sup>541</sup> T., 17.3.1936, p. 4.

<sup>542</sup> MGW., 27.12.1935, p. 502.

<sup>543</sup> T., 1.2.1936, p. 13.

<sup>544</sup> MGW., 24.4.1936, p. 321.

<sup>545</sup> T., 21.2.1936, p. 15, 6.

<sup>546</sup> MGW., 21.2.1936, p. 146.

<sup>547</sup> letter to the T. 28.1.1936, p. 6.

<sup>548</sup> MGW., 15.11.1935, p. 386.

<sup>549</sup> T., 3.2.1936, p. 9.

<sup>550</sup> K., Vol. III, § 3809m.

<sup>551</sup> S.R., 10.10.1936, p. 3.

<sup>552</sup> T., 8.8.1936, p. 11, 6.

<sup>553</sup> NED. sub 7b; from Shakespeare, 1607.

<sup>554</sup> K., Vol. III, § 3809m.

Examples of a) are given from 1448 onwards: *this mad-brain'd bridegroom took him such a cuffe*<sup>555</sup>. According to the NED. it is still used colloquially: *the ball took me an awful whack* on the chest<sup>556</sup>, but neither Mr. F. nor Mr. M. can recognise it as in any way usual.

Examples of b) are to be found even earlier; but in this case the NED. in its turn pronounces this usage 'obsolete'; the latest examples given date from the year 1533: when *he tooke them the bread... who tooke thee thys letter?*<sup>557</sup>. Here the NED. is decidedly mistaken. Although Mr. M. thinks that a constr. with a *to*-compl. is preferred in America, he admits that the two non-p.o. constr. is 'possible'. Mr. F., on the other hand, is quite positive that this constr. is 'common'. P. must have overlooked our examples, since he says that the NED. 'does not register a single example of the verb being construed with two non-p. objects; see the ninth (?) group of senses'; he also admits that this constr., of which he adduces examples from Thackeray and Mrs. Gaskell to modern times (Galsworthy and Shaw), 'appears to be common enough', but tones down his statement by adding: 'this does not, of course, mean that it is as usual as the constr. with the *to*-compl.'. Further modern examples (I refer the reader to P. without repeating those given by him): *she took the poor man a loaf* (K.; Mr. F.); *their wives take them* (the workmen) *their dinner* to the factory (K.; Mr. F.); *the secretary took him my message*<sup>558</sup>; here, *take him a halfpenny* and tell him to move on<sup>559</sup>; our runners *will take you messages* ...<sup>560</sup>; an English friend saved the life of a priest by *taking him lay clothes* into which he changed ...<sup>561</sup>; *I take my mother a bottle* of something<sup>562</sup>.

The p.p.c. seems to admit only the *to*-compl.: *a cup of tea was taken up to me* (Mr. F.; Mr. M.). P. says that the s.p.c. 'appears to be impossible'. This is true of America only. J. has an example: M. pleaded a headache very wisely, and *was taken a sympathetic cup of tea*<sup>563</sup>. Mr. F. says this constr. is 'possible'. Mr. M., however, confirms P.'s statement.

The two non-p.o. constr. is not confined to these two sense-groups, however. The NED. registers two more instances, so far as I can see; but it does not mention the two non-p.o. constr. as such: *take hym forthe a newe lesson*<sup>564</sup>; the discipline of war must *take you out other lessons of fury*<sup>565</sup>, in both of which 'take' is used in the obsolete sense of 'teach'. There may be other instances, for all I know, hidden away among the numerous quotations of the ninety sense-groups of this verb. But the two non-p.o. constr. is also possible in England in literal meanings: the court ruled that even his two wives and the alleged promise *to take himself a third* had nothing to do with his reasons<sup>566</sup> (this usage is unknown in

<sup>555</sup> sub 5b; from Shakespeare, 1596.

<sup>556</sup> ib.

<sup>557</sup> NED. sub 60; from More and Udall respectively.

<sup>558</sup> *Daily Express*, 10.5.1930, p. 1.

<sup>559</sup> Galsworthy, *To Let* (Tauchn.), p. 316.

<sup>560</sup> *Her Privates We*, 1930, p. 310.

<sup>561</sup> T., 6.8.1936, p. 10, 2.

<sup>562</sup> B. Goldman, *Red Road through Asia*, 1934, p. 11

<sup>563</sup> l.c., p. 310; from H. G. Wells.

<sup>564</sup> sub 81c; 1530.

<sup>565</sup> sub 85f; 1642.

<sup>566</sup> MGW., 17.7.1936, p. 48, 1.



America: Miss H.<sup>567</sup>). *I took me a book* and read<sup>568</sup>. This latter sentence, which has an old-fashioned ring about it, would be in modern English: *I took myself down a book* from the shelf (Mr. F.). The same constr. is possible in: *take me down* (= write down) *the facts* (Mr. F.). In both cases Mr. M. would either omit 'myself' (in the former sentence), or use a *for*-compl.: *\*take down the facts for me*.

The two non-p.o. constr. is moreover commonly used in two additional meanings, not registered in the NED., so far as I can see: a) in the sense of 'to conduct', b) in the sense of 'to cost'. Examples of a): *take the dog a run* (Mr. F.); *I took him a ride* over the common; *I took John a new way* (P.); J. (who takes this to be a case of 'two direct objects') has four more examples<sup>569</sup>. The s.p.c. is also possible (Mr. F.): his Royal Highness *was taken an airing*; the Princess *was taken a drive*<sup>570</sup>. The p.p.c., however, is unusual. Mr. M. thinks that this constr. is not used in America; he prefers a *for*-compl. instead, which is, of course, also frequent in England: *take the dog for a walk* (Wy.); *he took me (out) for a walk, for a drive*<sup>571</sup>. But there are American examples of the two non-p.o. constr.: *\*I ... took myself a walk* in the dark ...<sup>572</sup>; *\*she might take herself a moonlight canter* around the park<sup>573</sup>. An *on*-compl. may also be used: *he took his wife and secretary on a motor tour* in France<sup>574</sup>; *Mr. Eden took the House on a conducted tour* round British policy<sup>575</sup>.

Examples of b): *it took us two years* to make the necessary preparations (K.; Mr. M.; Mr. F.); that's enough *to take you all your time*<sup>576</sup>. The p.c. are unusual (Mr. M.; Mr. F.). A *for*-compl. (or rather: a prepositional accusative and infinitive constr.) is also possible: *it took two years for us* to make the necessary preparations (K.; Mr. M.; Mr. F.), as well as a personal constr.: *I took two years ...*

Jena.

G. KIRCHNER.

<sup>567</sup> Miss Betty Hines, of Los Angeles.

<sup>568</sup> Mackail, *W. Morris*, p. 28.

<sup>569</sup> l.c., p. 296; from Thackeray and Galsworthy respectively.

<sup>570</sup> ib., p. 312; from Thackeray.

<sup>571</sup> Kirkpatrick, *Handbook of Idiomatic English*.

<sup>572</sup> W. Burnett, *Two Men Free; The Albatross Book of American Short Stories*, 1935, p. 71.

<sup>573</sup> D. Parker, *Horsie*; ib., p. 300.

<sup>574</sup> T., 15.6.1936, p. 17, 3.

<sup>575</sup> MGW., 31.7.1936, p. 82, 1.

<sup>576</sup> H. G. Wells, *Chr. Alberta's Father* (Tauchn.), p. 283.

# Notes and News

## Vocabulary and Style of the Middle English Ancrene Riwe

The Ancrene Riwe of Morton's edition presents a language quite modern in its make-up, in so far as the two principal foreign strata of English are represented in something like the present-day ratio. Although written in a South-English dialect, the Nero-Ms. contains a not insignificant number of Scandinavian words. The most important have been arranged alphabetically: *ageliche* (awful, occurs in Ms. C, its English equivalent appears in N. as *(h)eihliche*) / *allegate* (in every way) / *angresful* (anxious) / *bagge* (bag) / *beoþe* (both) / *bon* (prayer) / *brunie* (corslet) / *cweise* (wound) / *?drupie* (sad) / *efne* (nature) / *eggen* (incite) / *feolawe* (fellow) / *flutten* (probably: subsist; Old Norse *flytja* : provide) / *garsum* (treasure) / *gistnen* (lodge) / *igreipēd* (prepared) / *grið* (peace) / *hauour* (apt) / *unhep* (mishap) / *hofleas* (unreasonable) / *(h)wingen* (wings) / *kesten* (cast) / *laste* (blame) / *lates* (behaviour) / *lawe* (law) / *lite* (colour) / *louh* (low) / *menske* (dignity) / *meoken* (humiliate) / *nai* (no) / *?nicken* (deny) / *oker* (usury) / *sker* (clear) / *skill* (reason) / *sluggi* (lazy) / *þrell* (slave) / *þwertour* (athwart) / *witterliche* (surely) / *wont* (want).

The Scandinavian pronoun has not yet made its appearance. But the more northern Ms. T has several Scandinavian words over and above those mentioned, e.g.: *glopnen* (affright), for which N. has *agesten* / *lohe* (flame), for which N. has *lei* / *lowse*, *lousse* (loose, occurs only in T. and C.; what N. has in its place is evidently a scribal error) / *ploh* (plough, for which N. has the oe. *suluh*) / *raikinde* (wandering, for which N. has *recchinde*) / *skerre* (shy, for which N. has *scheouh*) / *skulkin* (slink away; N.: *etlutien*) / *uggi* (dread greatly; N.: *agrupie*).

Of the words above five appeared as early as Oe., namely: *feolawe* / *garsum* / *grið* / *lawe* / *þrell*. All of these bear the stamp of officialdom (*feolaga* meant: sharer in official dignity). The other Scandinavian words quoted have an everyday look. The Scandinavian words had by now become so familiar that sound-substitution is frequent. The abstract ending appears as *leic* and *lac* : *godleic* : *godlac*; open and close dental are used in the same word: *wondrede* : *wondreðe*; *sk* and *sch* interchange: N. has e.g. *skill* : *schill*; Scandinavian *skife* appears in T. as *schive* (slice); for the native *heoneward* T. puts *heoðenward*.

Different forms of the Scandinavian word are recorded: as against N.'s *uðen* T. has *unðes* (cf. Norse *uðr* : *unnr*; possibly oe. *yþ* may have been in the writer's mind). The running together of a Scandinavian and an English word is seen in *slouhðe*, which owes its guttural to *sløgr* (which is found in Orm). The grip Old Norse had on the administrative vocabulary loosened and instead French took the lead for administrative and cultural purposes. There is a striking difference between the employment of French in Layamon and in Ancrene Riwe. The whole of Lay. with its more than 30000 half-lines contains at most 150 French words, many of which are only found in the 50 years later B-version. In the AR. the foreign words are numerous on every page, so to speak.

Too much has been made of a supposed tendency to translate French words into English in Lay. It is not correct to say that there is a case

of translation in the following lines from Lay.: *Inne Franse weren italde : twelfe iferan. Ða Freinsce heo cleopeden dusze pers.* The last word remains French throughout and is treated as such. In Ancrene Riwele there is very little translation; a clear case is: *audience, þet is iherinde on ure leodene.* The author emphasizes the translational character of the passage by adding the words *on ure leodene*. Now, there are a number of pleonasms in AR. such as: *cherite þet is luue / in desperaunce þet is in unhope & in unbileau* *forto beon iboruwen* (note the longish periphrasis!) / *two manere temptaciuns ... two kunne vondunges / pacience þet is þolemodnesse / lecherie þet is golnesse / ignoraunce þet is unwisdom & unwitenesse.*

A mere glance at the words quoted shows that they are all of them slogans or words that are meant to be fully realized in their far-reaching import. The pleonastic expressions here find their natural explanation. The ladies for whom the book was meant were members of the upper classes. Several of the Latin phrases are not turned into English at all. The ladies are supposed to understand quotations from Horace. An analysis of the supposed cases of translation will make the matter clear: *two manere temptaciuns*; *manere* is a frequent word in AR. and it occurs before the phrase in question without any translation (p. 50); so does *temptaciun*; but when the words are to be driven home to the mind and heart of the reader we find translation; *lecherie* too is found earlier in the book untranslated (p. 82). As to the word *cherite*, it is the only undoubted French word in the old text published by Heuser in Anglia (XXX).

There are, furthermore, cases of pleonastic phraseology where the native word precedes: *Isaie veieþ hope & silence, & kupleþ boþe togederes / nis þer no riht dom ne no riht gugement / overgeþ ham alle & passeþ ham alle / ne no man aski ou read ne cunsail.* We find repetitional phraseology in the case of exclusively native words: *unheleþ & unwrihþ hit / seoruhful & sori / uorto iseonne & icnowen / swote & swete*, etc. We even in the latter case find an introductory *þet is*, e.g., *Seinte Stefne underveng ham gledliche mid hommen ivolden, þet is cneolinde.*

French plurals are employed: *cwarreaus / kerneaus.*

Northern and central French forms occur side by side: *kecchen / kalengen : cherite / chastete / chaungen / charoine; weorre (war) : gile (trick).* The central French forms may be accounted for through the increasingly closer connection with the central (and Southern) parts of France. King Henry II married the princess Eleanor of Poitou and added Aquitaine to his dominions. He was himself the son of an Angevin father and half English and half Norman on his mother's side. In 1204 Normandy was lost. However short the duration of the Angevin inheritance, linguistically England came under the influence of more Southern French dialects. The oldest form of 'charity' in English is Norman: *karited* (Chron.). It has been superseded by *cherite* (the form found in AR.). In the case of 'carriage' the Picardian form has carried the day as against *charoine*; *asaumple* (example) is central French.

Other Norman forms in AR. are: the close o-sound, as reflected by *kunsceunce / cunsail*; further we find *ei* as in: *Beneit / Peitou.*

Although the writer of the AR. skilfully made use of the linguistic wealth at his disposal, the writing of books did not come easy to him. Says he: *me were leouere uorto don me toward Rome þen uorto biginnen hit* (sc.



the Book) *eft forto donne*. He pins his faith to the power of his native speech as against Latin: should it happen that the nuns should receive no help in the hour of temptation in spite of their Latin prayers, he advises them to try English: *zif ne cumeþ nout some help, gret luddure o þine owune ledene* (p. 290). And indeed the style of the author is rooted in the soil of everyday life. From that he culls his examples. In order to illustrate religious endurance he speaks of *þe wummon þet haueð forloren hire nelde* (needle) ... *& towent euerich strea uort he beo ifunden*. The first English University farce goes back to just the same domestic mishap. By way of driving home the dangers lurking in a life in this world it says: *bitweonen delices & eise & flessches este hwo was euer chaste? Hwo ber euer þur wiðinnen hire þet heo ne bernde? Pot þet walleð swuðe, nule he beon ouerladen, oðer kold water iworpen þerinne and brondes wiðdrawene*. Sluri, the kitchen-boy, comes in for his share: *beoþ bliðe on heorte zif ze þolieð daunger of Sluri, þe kokes knaue, þet wasscheð þe disshes iðe kuchene*.

But the important similes are such as disclose inner truths. The similes and metaphors of a modern poet throw new light on ideas or circumstances, which in this way come closer to the bosoms of men; they are felt to be part of our own selves, being new creations in our own consciousness. They fill the reader with a sense of his own power. Quite otherwise with religious symbolism. It comes as a kind of revelation from outside and fills the mind with reverence and awe. The inner meaning of human suffering and of human life on the whole was made clear for the devout mind through the allegorical exposition of the history of Elias: *þeos two þinges, wo & scheome, beoð Elies hweoles þet weren furene & beren him up to Parais. Fur is hot & read. Bi þe hete is understonden euerich wo þet eileð flesche. Scheome is understonden bi þe reade. Heo beoð her hweolinde ase hweoles þet ouerturneð sone, and ne lesteð none hwule*. This kind of simile is, of course, common. But more singular is the negative kind of allegory: *oðre pilegrimes goð mid swinke worte sechen one holie monnes bones, ase Sein James oðer Sein Giles: auh þeo pilegrimes þet goð toward heouene, heo goð forte beon isonted & forte iwinden God sult & alle his holie halewen*.

Religious doubts are as old as Religion itself. They may be of an intellectual or ethical nature. The latter are the most serious. They may have reference to the justice of eternal punishment. The idea of eternal punishment went far to undermine the religious life of young Georg Brandes, according to his own words in his autobiography. Eternal punishment is a bigger stumbling-block in Protestant than in Catholic countries. Purgatory and intercessional prayer on the part of the bereaved (which Plato already suggested in Phaidon) are a sort of safety-valve. Possibly the writer did not feel himself called upon to defend eternal punishment. The Church had it in its power to mediate and curtail eternity to 'a hundred thousand yeeres', which Dr. Faustus pleaded for. But there was another pressing ethical problem: What interest can God have in my sufferings in this world? Here AR. gives the solution in the following simile or, as it is called, *asample*: *A mon þet were ueor iuaren, & me come & tolde him þet his deore spuse murnede so swuðe efter him þet heo wiðuten him nefde no delit i none þinge ... nolde him liken betere þen þauh me seide him þet heo gleowede & gomeded & wedde mid oðer men & liuede in delices?*

The homely character of the similes gives us a close parallel to the

Griseldis story. In order to account for the severity of Providence the writer says: *Hwonne a mon haueð neoweliche wif iled hom, ... makeð him swuðe sterne, & went to þene grimme toþ uorte uonden zete zif he muhte hire luue toward him unuesten. A last, hwon he understont þet heo is al wel ituht, þet for none þinge þet he deð hire, heo ne luueð hine neuer þe lesse, þeonne scheaweð he hire þet he hire luueð sweteliche.*

The ladies for whom AR. was written were of high descent. They were distinguished for their nobility of mind and liberality of hand. From early youth they had renounced all the worldly splendour that was theirs for the mere asking: *muche word is of ou hu gentile wummen ze beoð: vor godleic & for ureoleic izerned of monie ... ine blostme of ower zuweðe uorleten alle worldes blissen, & bicomen ancren.* They were Christ's voluntary Griseldis-brides.

As a sort of afterglow of worldly life the author describes to his *ancren* an element of knightly life: *(Crist) dude him ine turnement, & hefde vor his leofmonnes luue his scheld, ase kene kniht, on eueriche half iburled.*

There is much humanism in AR. Dr. Newman vindicated the development of personality in religious life. The *Ancrene Riwe* is a proof that it found a place in Middle English religious life, too.

Birkeröd, Denmark.

N. BÖGHOLM.

### George Moore and his Friendship with W. B. Yeats

George Moore and William Butler Yeats have told us in interesting autobiographical papers of their friendship; Moore in his trilogy *Hail and Farewell (Ave, Salve, & Vale)* in 1911-1914, Yeats more recently in a collection of reminiscences *Dramatis Personae 1896-1902* (Macmillan 1936). In many particulars Yeats's book seems to be an answer to his dead friend's chronicle of the Celtic Revival, though *Hail and Farewell* is never mentioned in such connection. Even a slight comparison of their reminiscences allows us to gain an interesting insight into a singular friendship and into a strange, personal controversy between two great writers.

It is curious that Moore should ever have found his way back to Ireland and should have lived and worked there — even if only for a short time — with an Irish poet. Neither in thought nor in sympathy is Moore Irish. Already in his youth distaste for his native country drove him to lay the more forbidding scenes of *A Drama in Muslin* in Ireland, in order to practise his cruel and bitter sarcasms on his own countrymen. In his *Lettres sur l'Irlande*, written for the *Figaro* in 1886, he abused the Irish character, the Irish customs, the Irish Catholics. "Coarse, common, greasy, worn-out, black, weed-grown, dilapidated" are some of the uncomplimentary epithets he employs in his descriptions of Irishmen and Irish landscape in *Parnell and his Island*. All the more are we astonished to see him return to Ireland in 1899 and collaborate with an Irish writer in the revival of the Irish theatre.

What was, then, the probable motive of this sudden return since it could not be affection for his native land? In *Hail and Farewell* Moore claims to have been driven out of England by the injustices and atrocities of the

Boer War. Yet it is hard to believe that this can be the voice of the same rebel who, imbued with confused notions of French naturalism and enthralled by the Baudelairian philosophy, came back to England with the words "Épater le bourgeois" on his banner and with the *Confessions* in his pocket. "Pity, that most vile of all vile virtues, has never been known to me," he shouted at that time; "injustice we worship."

The genuine cause of his hasty flight from London must have lain deeper. Moore's life, which is reflected in his work, reveals a man who liked literary adventures. Moore was a restless wanderer, in eternal pursuit of Art. More than once he paddled against the stream, always preferring the untrodden and unusual path to the well-worn highway. Moore had an invincible impulse to do pioneer work, and the stagnant period of 1895-1898 thus put a heavy and almost unbearable strain upon him. He was convinced that Zolaism, which for himself he had exhausted in *A Mummer's Wife* and *Esther Waters*, would never get a strong foothold in England. Moore was no longer taken seriously. His novels of this period of discontent (*Celibates* 1895 and *Evelyn Innes* 1898) announce a definite break with the French influence, but without putting anything new and original in its place. He felt that somehow he was checked in his art and inspiration was failing him. Moreover, new stars were rising in the London literary sky. So Moore was only too glad to learn from Yeats and Edward Martyn of a revival of Irish literature. Once more there seemed to be a vacant pedestal waiting for Moore to mount it. A new aestheticism was in the air. Ireland — "The Untilled Field"! Moore suddenly wanted to till it, to revive the old, dying language. He now believes it his mission to give a new literature to his native country. Surely this would turn out to be the sensational literary adventure for which he longed. Yeats, already the fervent leader of the Celtic Revival, would be a useful instrument to put Moore on the right way. "I cannot recall a case of man or woman who ever occupied any considerable part of my thoughts without contributing largely towards my moral or physical welfare ... I never had useless friends hanging about me" (*Confessions*). Thus Moore's "friendship" with W. B. Yeats began.

It was an ill-assorted couple of birds that for a short time roosted together on the same branch. Their friendship, based on Moore's side almost entirely on self-interest, was liable to be violently shaken at any moment. Besides, they were too diverse in character; Moore was fundamentally a realist, Yeats the very opposite. The admirer of Baudelaire, the imitator of Zola and Flaubert, the naturalist nurtured in Parisian cafés could hardly walk hand in hand with the occultist who "worshipped the casting of horoscopes" (*Ave*), or with the mystic who, instead of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, talked of the Cabala, of the Rosicrucians or of Jacob Boehme.

This difference of character in Moore and Yeats is so distinctly marked that neither of them kept his personal prejudices out of his recorded memories. Both are biased in their mutual description and observation. Their reminiscences are highly coloured with emotion, and the mutual criticism is very often merciless and harsh. The realist Moore reveals Yeats as the perpetual dreamer, who, even in animated conversation, would suddenly become lost in meditation, murmuring "some phrase about beautiful verses." Ironically Moore notices Yeats's "pale Buddhist hands," his manner of reading verse in a voice "one can hear on Sunday in any Methodist chapel." Moore never wholly forgot the violent antipathy



Yeats had provoked in him on their first meeting: "A long black cloak drooping from his shoulders, a soft black sombrero on his head, a voluminous black silk tie flowing from his collar, loose black trousers dragging untidily over his long heavy feet" (*Ave*). This elaborate description is hardly fair to the youthful Yeats. Moore must have forgotten his own craze to distinguish himself by extravagant clothes — "his (Moore's) tiny hat, his long hair, his Parisian cut clothes and his Capoul-like beard give him a very strange and very anomalous air" (*Parnell and his Island*) — otherwise he would scarcely have concluded from Yeats's appearance that his art could be nothing more than "a merely pretty externality."

Yeats, on the other hand, sees in Moore only the small boy who one day stole away, stripped himself of his clothes and ran naked in front of his governess, screaming in delight at the embarrassment he was causing. This typical anecdote, told by Moore himself in *Ave*, is supplemented by many piquant stories related by Yeats in *Dramatis Personae*. They reveal to us a Moore who was violent and coarse in temper, who abused waiters and cooks, who annoyed his old neighbour by throwing stones at her cats and rattling his stick on the railings at midnight to make her dog bark. We are shown a Moore brutal and caustic about his friends, fond of scandals and indiscretions, talking incessantly of his mistresses, and who "in his relations with women touched madness." And had not Moore laughed at Yeats's appearance, at that "tall black figure standing at the edge of the lake ... looking like a great umbrella forgotten by some picnic party"? *Dramatis Personae* on this topic does not fall below *Hail and Farewell*. Moore is described as "a man carved out of a turnip, looking out of astonished eyes"; his body is "insinuating, upflowing, circulative, curvicular, pop-eyed."

So far Yeats and Moore have disclosed each other's personalities in a stern and pitiless, frequently in a crude and grievous, manner. Yet possibly they have not been wholly unjust. But when they come to criticise the respective artist and writer, both are less convincing.

Moore does not think that Yeats's literary productions are of high value. The author of *Flowers of Passion* admires, however, the wonderful poems full of charm that Yeats wrote when he was a boy at Sligo and when he was content to write simply. But in London Yeats was filled with yearning for a style of his own and at the time of the Celtic Revival he had discovered it. This, argues Moore in *Vale*, proved to be very unfortunate for Yeats's literary career: "A man may tell the subject of his poem and write it, but if he tells *how* he is going to write his poem, he will never write it." It is strange to hear such arguments from a writer who, talking in Parisian cafés about the contemporary literary movement, became badly infected with the difficult problem of style. From the very beginning the sense of form was strong in Moore. There is scarcely a novel that has not been carefully remodelled, laboriously rewritten, and republished in a new or revised edition. Moore himself confessed in the new edition of *Vain Fortune*: "I am a victim of the disease of rewriting." When the *Spectator* had severely criticised the careless writing of *Mike Fletcher*, the author was broken-hearted. In a desperate letter to Clara Lanza he wrote — and his statement seems to be honest — "I thought it far away my best work. I forged every chapter like a sword, every sentence like a knife ..."

Moore's firm belief that Yeats, in his unfortunate search for a style, had

ruined his later writing cannot have made pleasant reading for the poet, for Yeats seems unable to forget this adverse and unsparing criticism. In *Dramatis Personae* he repays in the same coin. First he ridicules the education of Moore who "came from a house where there was no culture," who had not read a play of Shakespeare even at the end of his life. Because Moore did not learn from books but from conversation, from acted plays, or from pictures, Yeats argues that Moore "did not know that style existed until he returned to Ireland in middle life."

Yeats regrets that Moore ever came to Ireland to collaborate with him. For now Moore discovered style and — what a strange coincidence with Moore's criticism of Yeats in *Hail and Farewell* — "this misfortune made barren his later years." Yeats does not prove this statement. He admits some masterpieces of the young Moore — Moore, too, had spoken of the charming poetry of the young Yeats. Though Yeats approves even of *Muslin*, he does not mention Moore's later writings, neither *Hail and Farewell* nor *Héloise and Abélard* in which critics could not fail to discover a certain beauty of language. And we miss altogether *The Brook Kerith*, an outstanding work which Humbert Wolfe — perhaps too enthusiastically — proclaims "the greatest single literary achievement of our time and possibly the greatest prose work, except the Bible, in the English tongue."

It is by no means surprising that the antithetical characters of Moore and Yeats proved an insuperable obstacle to their collaboration. Their alliance to produce plays for the new Irish Theatre was doomed to failure from the beginning. The writing of *Diarmuid and Grania* was a farce; such, at any rate, is the impression we get from Moore's account in *Hail and Farewell*. Yeats neither denies nor confirms Moore's statement that both had long talks about horizontal and perpendicular acts and about the difficulty of style, which was to be overcome by Moore's writting his part in French. What dreadful French Moore wrote is shown in letters and translations published in Hone's *Life of George Moore*. Yeats, on the other hand, points out in *Dramatis Personae* that Moore had no feeling for words in themselves, no sensuous and rhythmical mind, and therefore "required many dull and numb words."

Finally Moore was convinced that "two such literary lunatics" could not possibly carry on. He thought any further association with Yeats would be his ruin. Lady Gregory, too, considered that such a partnership would injure Yeats's own art. Moore hated this lady's influence over Yeats. He cannot help speaking in ironical terms of her devotion to the poet and of the constant tutelage under which Yeats was writing. Her motherly concern for Yeats's health was shown when she told Moore that he must be careful not to overwork Yeats and that "after two hours the poet was to have a glass of milk."

In *Dramatis Personae* Yeats tries to explain the complete break in their friendship. He had told Moore of a fantastic plot for a play and had suggested collaboration. But when Moore dropped out of the Irish literary movement in 1901, Yeats wrote *Where there is Nothing* despite Moore's telegraphed assertion — an assertion that proved to be untrue — that he had already written a novel on the scenario they had composed together. Though months later a friend tried to bring them together, they could never again be cordial; disgust and distrust were the only feelings left.

The outer bonds were now definitely broken. Yet we are not astonished

to read in Hone's *Life* that Moore still clung secretly to his old partner and often complained during the later years in Ebury Street, "Why does Yeats never come to see me?" In spite of his denial in *Hail and Farewell*, Moore felt that it was chiefly to the personal influence of Yeats that he owed his renewed search for the ideal rhythm in composition which gives the unique touch to his mature writing. Yeats, however, does not seem to have missed the company of George Moore. He seldom speaks of him. In the lecture that he delivered to the Royal Academy of Sweden when he received the Nobel Prize in 1923, he promised his audience "to tell of the labours, triumphs and troubles of my fellow-workers." Amongst them he speaks of Lady Gregory, John Synge, and Edward Martyn, but never mentions Moore who was also a member of this circle. But *Dramatis Personae* shows that Yeats could never forget Moore. The bitter irony read between the lines is evidence that Yeats could never forgive his dead friend the sarcastic smile with which Moore must have composed his trilogy on the Irish Movement.

Aarau, Switzerland.

WALTHER GILOMEN.

**In Memoriam H. Poutsma.** One of the foremost Dutch Anglicists, Dr. Hendrik Poutsma, author of *A Grammar of Late Modern English* and other works, died at Amsterdam on April 5, aged 80. Born at Gorredijk in Friesland as the son of a clergyman, he began his career as an elementary teacher, but, after a stay in England, qualified for the secondary school certificate in 1880, and subsequently taught English at the H.B.S. (Realschule) at Almelo, at an H.B.S. at Amsterdam, and, from 1907—1922, at the Barlaeus Gymnasium in that city.

Poutsma was in many ways a typical example of the self-trained Dutch neophilologist (if one may use the term) of the older generation. It was not until six years after he took his master's certificate that the first Professor of English in a Dutch University, Beckering Vinckers, entered upon his duties at Groningen; it was not until 1921 that Dutch professors of modern languages were allowed to examine their own pupils and to present them for degrees. In Germany, a man like Poutsma would have studied 'Anglistik' and one or two other subjects at one or more Universities; after graduation he would probably have kept in touch with academic work, and in due course might have come to fill a chair. In Holland, he owed nothing to the University, apart from an honorary degree when he was seventy-five; he specialized in a single modern language, laying the foundations of his extensive knowledge by a prolonged stay in the country where it was spoken; the only career open to him was that of a school teacher; and he had to carry on the researches to which his studious nature impelled him when the day's work was done.

The circumstances just mentioned may help to account for some of the limitations of Poutsma's scholarly vision; they certainly make one marvel all the more at the extent and quality of his achievement. For sheer bulk he leaves his fellow-workers in the same field far behind, as will be clear from a list of his publications:



## A Grammar of Late Modern English

### Part I. The Sentence (812 pp.)

- 1904 Section I. The Elements of the Sentence.  
Section II. The Composite Sentence.

### Part II. The Parts of Speech (1437 + 891 pp.)

- 1914 Section I A. Nouns, Adjectives and Articles.  
1916 Section I B. Pronouns and Numerals.  
1926 Section II. The Verb and the Particles.

In 1928 he published a second edition of Part I (First Half: The Elements of the Sentence; Second Half: The Composite Sentence; 1057 pp. in all), for which the greater part of the book had been re-written. There had been separate publications in 1921 (*The Characters of the English Verb and the Expanded Form*), 1922 (*Mood and Tense of the English Verb*) and 1923 (*The Infinitive, the Gerund and the Participles of the English Verb*), but of these the greater part was incorporated with Part II, Section II, of the *Grammar*. A few articles, in *English Studies*, *Neophilologus* and the *Curme Volume of Linguistic Studies*, complete the list. In addition to all this, the indefatigable worker left at least one unpublished treatise (on 'the government of verbs, adjectives and nouns', cf. *Grammar*, I. i<sup>2</sup>. 258) behind.

Poutsma's *Grammar*, by its very size, is not so much a handbook as a work of reference. As he has pointed out himself in the Preface to the second edition of Part I: 'It is for reasoned information about details that the inquiring student will most frequently wish to turn to the book.' Indeed it is the most detailed and comprehensive grammatical inventory of modern English ever drawn up. Two peculiarities strike one at the outset. In the first place, to Poutsma the English language was exclusively the language of books and of such newspapers as *The Times* and *The Westminster Gazette*. 'It has again been my constant endeavour to give a methodical description of the English language as it presents itself in the printed documents of the last few generations' (I. i<sup>2</sup>., Preface). The following sentence is revealing from more than one point of view: 'In arranging the elements of a sentence, as they appear in print, the language is guided by the following principles' (I. ii<sup>2</sup>. 387). The spoken language he did not really regard as a fit object of scientific inquiry. This preference for the written language, surprising, perhaps, in one who served his apprenticeship to his chosen craft in England itself, also left its mark on his English style, which throughout his life remained somewhat stiff and bookish.

Another feature of Poutsma's treatment of modern English is already hinted at in one of the quotations in the preceding paragraph. When he began to plan his work, the rigid distinction of synchronic and diachronic linguistics was unknown, and the prestige of the neo-grammarians was still powerful enough to affect even one in whose scientific training the University had had no hand. Though he expressly disclaims any profound knowledge of Old and Middle English, he cannot forbear from taking his

illustrations of 'late' modern English usage from Shakespeare, the Authorized Version, and numerous seventeenth and eighteenth century authors. At first these illustrations were not even arranged chronologically, as he regretfully admits in the Preface to the second edition. The treatment is thus, in his own words, 'historical up to a certain point', but the effect is sometimes that of a blur rather than of a sharp contour — a defect inherent in most works of a semi-historical character.

Any criticism of his methods and principles, however, stands rebuked by the unassuming modesty of the man. At 47, he apologizes for 'going thus early to press'. At 71, he writes of his monumental work (how he would have deprecated the term!): 'If it has any merit, it owes it to the fact that it comments systematically on the problems with which also Modern English abounds, and which have to be solved independently of the help of Old- or Middle English. Even if some of these comments should prove to be fallacious, the examples with which they have been furnished may be useful to future investigators.' Where another might have claimed to have 'solved' a problem, Poutsma writes: 'Whoever attempts to bring a knotty and controverted problem of idiom or grammar to clearness, i.e. into a state in which it *can be submitted to competent opinion*<sup>1</sup> in all or most of its bearings, ...' Modest and lovable as a man, thorough and conservative as a scholar, Poutsma has earned for himself a permanent place in the history of English studies, not in his own country alone, but wherever the English language is studied in a spirit of scientific inquiry. — Z.

**English Studies in Switzerland.** At a meeting of representatives from all parts of Switzerland of the English teachers in the universities and secondary schools of the country which took place at Berne on May 1st. it was decided to organize a separate English group within the Swiss Association of Secondary School Teachers. The final step in the constitution of the new Schweizerischer Anglistenverband — Association suisse des Maîtres d'Anglais will be taken at the general meeting of the larger association at Baden in the autumn. — H. L.

## Reviews

*Milton and Wordsworth, Poets and Prophets. A Study of their Reactions to Political Events.* By SIR HERBERT J. C. GRIERSON. 185 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1937. 8/6 net.

My principal grievance against the latest work of the distinguished Professor-Emeritus of English Literature in the University of Edinburgh is concerned with the title-page. One naturally expects the two poets to be

<sup>1</sup> Our italics.

treated at something like the same length, instead of which one finds 146 pages devoted to Milton and 36 to Wordsworth. Secondly, the sub-title, 'a study of their reactions to political events,' does not nearly indicate all the ground covered by Sir Herbert. Aesthetic appreciation, discussion of technical points and the refutation of criticism by predecessors and contemporaries are among the not least attractive features of this book. In so far there is no reason to complain of the discrepancy between the promise held out and its generous fulfilment. But the disproportionate measure accorded to the two poets seems to me somewhat regrettable. The conclusion at which Prof. Grierson arrives is that, everything considered, Wordsworth was more of a prophet than Milton. If, as in the case of the present writer, one is not altogether convinced by the argument, it does seem a pity that an equal chance has not been given to both.

A synopsis of the argument is to be found in the preface where the author says: 'whereas Milton's final pronouncement seems to me to be the expression of a conclusion reached by conscious deduction from his experiences, ... Wordsworth's deepest convictions, whatever their content and worth, were reached intuitively, prophetically.' In order that there may be no misunderstanding at the outset between the reader and himself, Prof. Grierson in the first chapter of his book elaborates his conception of prophetic poetry with the help of illustrations from the Old Testament. Prophetic poetry, though intuitive, is unthinkable without reason, but reasoning does not enter into it — a distinction, which, as the author remarks, is questioned by Saurat. Moreover, it delivers a message to mankind, and is not solely concerned with the individual experience of the poet. The author next proceeds to argue that in his first contributions to the religious and political warfare of his day Milton writes as a prophet, as one burdened with a message which he has to deliver, not as one actuated by personal anger. Milton's first unhappy marriage is then dealt with, and the author's conviction stated that it did an injury, never quite repaired, to the emotional, sympathetic side of his haughty character. In the discussion of *Paradise Lost* the theme of what constitutes prophetic poetry is again taken up. 'Of intuitive, prophetic poetry the characteristic is this ... that style and thought are inseparable, that these poets ... write most imaginatively when their thought is at once profound and passionate.'<sup>1</sup> (p. 95). And again, 'didactic poetry ... never becomes poetry, pure and simple, till the didactic becomes merged in the prophetic, till you feel that the poet is not expounding or defending a thesis but pouring forth in imaginative language and moving rhythms the intuitive images which rise from the unanalysable blend of sense, emotion and thought.' (p. 115.)

At this point I would try to explain, however diffidently, why Prof. Grierson has not quite convinced me that Milton cannot lay claim to the name of a prophet-poet and that Wordsworth can. From the foregoing it will be readily gathered that the author has made it perfectly clear what he understands by prophetic poetry and what is his conception of a prophet. Though a complete layman in matters theological I cannot help thinking that there are still other aspects of a prophet, which the author has not touched upon. Is there not in every prophet an element of fanaticism? Is it not

<sup>1</sup> In this résumé of the book's contents I have consistently used the author's own words, this being the only way for me to do it full justice. If this has not specially been indicated, it was only from an aversion to dotting the page with inverted commas.



characteristic of a prophet that he is absolutely convinced of being right? Is it not true that the moment he begins to see that there may be something to be said for the other man's point of view, he is no longer any good as a prophet? If these tentative suppositions contain any truth, then it seems to me that Milton's claims to the prophet's mantle are rather stronger than Wordsworth's. In connection with *Paradise Lost* Prof. Grierson remarks:

We remember less Christ the promised redeemer than Christ who goes forth in all the panoply of Ezekiel's vision to overthrow the rebellious angels. Perhaps if Milton had read the greater prophets aright, and not like most Protestants of his day been more interested in the apocalyptic forecasts of "the two-handed engine at the door", he might have found a better conception or produced a more Christian impression. (p. 105.)

To me the famous couplet from *Lycidas* would occur immediately if asked for an example of prophetic utterance in Milton's poetry. Again,

Milton does indeed take the Scriptures as his chief guide in portraying God, but like all the great Protestant Reformers he misplaced the values, laying stress, in the Old Testament, on the historical books and the apocalyptic element in the later parts of the Book of Daniel, and in the New Testament on the Book of Revelation, while in the New Testament more generally the argumentative Epistles overshadowed the revelation of Christ in the Gospels.

I appreciate the antithesis between 'argumentative' and 'revelation' in support of Prof. Grierson's case, but is not the term 'misplaced' used purely subjectively, and, anyway, would such a misplacement necessarily detract from the prophetic value of Milton's utterance? 'Milton's Christ,' says Grierson, 'is not quite the Christ of the Gospel of St. John. He is drawn on the lines on which Milton had already sketched Cromwell in the hour of Cromwell's greatest ascendancy.' Without the slightest desire to shift the issue to the domain of politics one cannot repress the thought that Cromwell, Lenin, Hitler and Mussolini have perhaps a little more of the prophet about them than certain statesmen to whom, on other grounds, some of us might feel more attracted.

Needless to say, the author is quite consistent in his choice of arguments for assigning to Wordsworth the prophetic qualities which he denies to Milton. Milton's attitude 'to us is harsh and dictatorial; and it is here that Wordsworth supplies what we seek in Milton. Wordsworth's sympathy with human nature was intense' (p. 181.). Not disputing the truth of this statement, it does not seem to strengthen the author's case any more than the fact that in Professor Lane Cooper's *Concordance to the Poems of William Wordsworth* the word 'love' occupies thirteen pages. If it is true that 'Wordsworth had to be more cautious' than Milton, it is also difficult to visualize a cautious prophet. And the picture of Milton's old age, finely drawn by Prof. Grierson in the words

During the remainder of his life he sat apart, grimly contemplating the ruin of his hopes, but still faithful to the cause, completing his great poems of which the theme from first to last is liberty, the freedom and responsibility of man (p. 151)

is, to one reader at least, more suggestive of the prophet than the happy metaphor with which Wordsworth's maturity is depicted:

France of the Revolution his mistress was; England and her morals, customs, prejudices became his wife. (p. 156.)

How full of good things the book is, apart from the rights or wrongs of the main argument. What a redoubtable adversary Sir Herbert proves himself to be when he repulses Mr. Belloc's ill-advised attack on the form of Milton's sonnets, or reduces to nought Mr. Dobree's astounding contention that 'Milton made the language stiff and tortuous, even distorted, unusable in that form by other poets, as Keats was to discover, but Dryden made it miraculously flexible. Milton may be the greater poet of the two, but in this respect *he injured our poetry*, while Dryden conferred upon it the greatest possible benefit.' What delightful play does he make with the obscure phrase 'unified sensibility' used by Mr. T. S. Eliot and his school in praise of metaphysical poetry, obligingly paraphrasing it for them into intelligible language as 'thought that feels and feeling that compels to think.'

A very striking feature of Sir Herbert's method is his use of present-day political terminology for the characterization of phenomena belonging to a dim past, as when he says that 'Milton would combine the licence of criticism of America with the strict regulation of Soviet Russia' or when he describes Milton's Heaven as 'a totalitarian state.' Such things are not merely felicitous phrases, but demonstrate the author's realization of the continuity of human thought.

Particularly gratifying to Dutch readers are the frequent references to the work of Vondel. But then, in this respect Sir Herbert could hardly add to the debt of gratitude we already owe him for the marvellous translations of Hooft and Boutens which appeared last year in *Two Dutch Poets*, a reprint of the Taylorian lecture given at Oxford.<sup>2</sup> There, as also in the volume here reviewed, Prof. Grierson shows himself to be that very rare combination of a scholar, a critic and a literary artist.

The Hague.

J. KOOISTRA.

---

*The Letters of Sir Walter Scott*. Vol. IX: 1825—1826. Vol. X: 1826-1828. Edited by H. J. C. GRIERSON. Centenary Edition. London: Constable. 1935—1936. 18 sh. each.<sup>1</sup>

These two volumes contain the letters of the most painfully eventful years in Scott's life. Superficially regarded and with respect to Scott's feelings and hardships, it was a period of disaster, exposure and struggle. From a more distant and detached point of view, it is seen to have been a time of unexampled triumph, for it demonstrated to Scott, as nothing else could have done, how completely he possessed the love and confidence of Scotland. I am unaware of any parallel in history to the spontaneity and heartiness with which help and support were offered to him on every hand. I have elsewhere emphasised the loveliness of his character. This, apart altogether from his popularity as an author and his position as a national hero, the greatest Scot of his time, explains the general

---

<sup>2</sup> *Two Dutch Poets*. By Sir Herbert Grierson. The Taylorian Lecture 1936. 46 pp. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1936. 2s. net.

<sup>1</sup> The concluding volumes XI and XII (the latter published April 8th, 1937) will be reviewed shortly.

and unhesitating attitude towards him in the crisis. 'I have no enemies' he said, but what was very much more to the point, in the hour of need all men were his friends.

If, however, we expect to read of all this in these letters, we shall be disappointed. The Journal which he began at this time, just when he still imagined himself on the pinnacle of fortune, shows his growing uneasiness as the news came down from London, how he felt the blow to his pride, his sorrow at the hardships it would bring on his wife and his daughter Anne, and on his servants, and his sense of the universal kindness; but there is scarcely a word of this in his letters, even those to his intimates. It was only sensible to keep strict silence on the impending disaster so long as it was only impending and still conceivably avertible. When it had happened, and the knowledge was common property, his characteristic stoicism made him turn a calm and unflinching face to the world. Stoicism is a noble trait in the conduct of life but apt to be a dull one in letters. The repression of what filled his mind, as if all were well, — at least not so bad as it might have been — resulted in superficiality and lifelessness. He was writing inevitably with the top of his mind. The depths, his secret thoughts, fears, regrets and ponderings on the past he kept for his Journal. Long after, Maria Edgeworth confided to Lockhart her conviction that Scott's stoic self-repression was a chief cause of his premature collapse and that a safety valve would have helped him. But the Journal was his safety valve. One has only to read the extraordinary unbosoming in the entry of December 18th, 1825: "*Ballantyne called on me this morning. Venit illa suprema dies. My extremity is come*" etc., to realise this, and to see how greatly the letters would have gained in human interest and vivacity of idiom if allowed some of the Journal's spontaneity and candour. Once and only once he drops the mask a little. It was when he wrote to Lady Louisa Stuart, his lifelong friend. Here is the letter, dated April 13th, 1826:

"For some time writing has been painful to me saving what I must needs write and that being the discharge of a duty is always a sort of pleasure — at least you are interested while about it and contented when it is over. But of late I have had and still have terrible anxiety on Sophia's account and that of the poor child. I hardly ever regarded him but as something 'ent to us from another world and viewed with terror the doating anxiety of the poor father and mother. The sweet little boy was in himself very taking and I have frequently hardened my heart as well as I could to prevent its twining itself around my heart strings as it did about theirs. It is very clever perfectly natural and good humoured — in short the thing you would most wish to see at your knee had it had less of the stamp of early fragility fixed upon it. They are now the mother and baby as your Ladyship probably knows at Brighton and I own to you my best hopes are that God will conduct my daughter through her approaching confinement and permit her to be the mother of a healthy infant before

— The bird is flown  
That we have made so much of.

My wife too — the faithful partaker of much weal and woe and who has in judging of what is upright and honourable the spirit of a hundred princesses is very unwell. She is obliged to take foxglove — a terrible medicine in its effects but which alleviates very considerably the disease and gives me hope to see her respond [? restored] to tolerable health.

My own affairs assume every day a more comfortable aspect. My chief and only subject of impatience is the regret that requires people to wait a little for their due so far as I have been involved in the misfortunes of others. But my agent John Gibson whom I four or five years since recommended to Lord Montagu has done among the booksellers



more in a few weeks than I have done in many years. He has sold the impending novel of *Woodstock* for £8000 and upwards and has similar offers for my sketch of Napoleon. If these hold a year or two's labour will place me in the happy alternative called *statu quo* — But I am very easy about that matter so long as I see the speedy prospect of getting rid of debt. I feel much like my friend John Hookham Frere whom they could not get out of the Lazaretto at the expiry of Quarantine...

But work I must — it has become a part of my nature and as I become daily more solitary the pen and reading are of course my best resources. Every sort of society which I cared for is very much diminished by death and absence. The only man in this country whom I could regard quite as a companion from his taste and accomplishments poor John (Scott) of Gala is I fear very ill..... I had a sincere love for him — we spent part of a little tour in France together immediately after Waterloo and I shall never forget his matchless good humour and on one or two occasions when there really seemed serious personal danger his ready gallantry and spirit — One night we were apparently in the predicament of fighting for our lives — I was even then a horse in point of strength and fearless by constitution and yet with his delicate person and softer breeding he was the foremost of the two let me do what I would. Poor poor fellow.....

As for me I think the world is gliding from under my feet

For many a lad I loved is dead  
And many a lass grown old  
And when I think on those are fled  
My weary heart grows cold.

But this has been will be and must be.

All health to you My dear Lady Louisa and all happiness..... You will have difficulty I fear in reading this but my eyes are failing me fast. I cannot charge them with idleness —" (IX. 489f.).

This letter, unusual in its confidentiality, is usual enough in other respects, notably in its real or assumed optimism about his debts. In its sadness, it reflected Scott's unhappy life at the time. His wife died less than a month later, he himself had been unwell since that violent attack of the gravel at New Year, his eyes were failing and his hands stiffening with rheumatism, he was living in Edinburgh most of the time alone and in lodgings, having sold his town house, "Poor No. 39", he was writing desperately at *Woodstock* and the *Life of Napoleon*, which, far from a sketch, ran into nine volumes, he was planning *The Chronicles of the Canongate*, contributing long articles to Lockhart's *Quarterly* and elsewhere, besides attending the Court regularly, — and he was fifty-five years old. It is not surprising that the letters in the second of the two volumes are mostly in a melancholy tone. It is relieved on three occasions — the brief exchange of compliments with Goethe (which introduces for a fleeting moment the incongruous figure of young Carlyle) (X. 247), the preparations for the duel with General Gourgaud (X. 270), and the public avowal of the authorship of *Waverley* (X. 172).

It is highly interesting and satisfactory to see from a note (X. 29) that we are shortly to expect a *Life of Sir Walter* by Prof. Grierson. No one is better equipped to write a thoroughly up-to-date and fair biography than the editor of the letters.

Groningen.

J. A. FALCONER.

*The Fabulous Opera, A Study of Continuity in French and English Poetry of the Nineteenth Century.* By Dr. D. G. VAN DER VAT. 211 pp. Groningen, Batavia: J. B. Wolters. 1936. Price f 3.90.

The title of this extremely well-informed and able survey of the aesthetic opinions of a representative group of poets of the Romantic Age (for such is the Nineteenth Century which Dr. Van der Vat has in mind) is borrowed from Rimbaud ("Je devins un opéra fabuleux"), but the quality of the exposition and the principles guiding it have a distinctly Crocean flavour. To researches of this kind we have been long accustomed in Italy, where the influence of Croce has resulted in greater clearness of critical appreciation but also in a facile cocksureness on the part of dozens of young men who have easily mastered the philosopher's method without being able to imitate either his passion for erudite research or his humour. Dr. Van der Vat has had hardly any occasion to show this latter (unless apropos of Poe), but he has given ample evidence of his admirable erudition, both on the philosophical side (his Minerva has not sprung fully grown and armed out of Croce's brain! he is well versed also in Plotinus, Bremond, Yen Yü, to mention only a few distant points of an essentially uniform map), and as far as his first-hand acquaintance with XIXth century literature is concerned. The greatest curiosity of the book is certainly to find such a title given to a research of the Crocean school; because the whole of modern poetry which may be dated from Rimbaud and Laforgue is as good as straw to the Parthenopean pundit (quite recently he has contributed to *La Critica* an essay on *Un Gesuita inglese poeta*, G. M. Hopkins, where one would search in vain for Hopkins the forerunner of much contemporary English verse; Croce's Hopkins, in his Italian translation, is much nearer to Salvatore di Giacomo). Dr. Van der Vat does not follow Croce in trying to condemn the most representative modern poetry as a prey to affectation, conceit, interference of practical aims, etc.; he would have done well, however, to show how the aesthetic theories which form the backbone of the Romantic movement have reached in our time their *reductio ad absurdum*, so much so as to provoke in many countries (the young Communist poets of England, for instance), a reaction which is calculated to horrify all Crocean critics.

Dr. Van der Vat has developed an observation often made about the striking similarity between the poetry of early romanticism in England and the poetry of the French symbolists and their immediate forerunners; he shows that the similarity is also evident in the aesthetic and metaphysical ideas held by the two groups of poets. The same aesthetic convictions run through the works of the English poets from Blake to Yeats and the French from Sainte-Beuve to Maeterlinck; for the convenience of the exposition the author has divided the matter into three sections, the first relating to the aesthetic superiority of intuition over reason, the second to the autonomy of art with respect to the other activities (practical, ethical) of the spirit, the third to the independence of art from any form of imitation of perceptible reality. Thus in each section we are confronted with the same pageant of poets, i.e., on the English side, Blake, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Shelley, Keats, Browning, Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Francis Thompson, Russell and Yeats; on the French side, Sainte-Beuve, Gérard de Nerval, Baudelaire, Rimbaud, Laforgue, Verlaine, Villiers de l'Isle Adam, Mallarmé, and Maeterlinck.

Poe is considered in connection with Baudelaire, since it is as "a fictitious character created by Baudelaire in his own likeness" that he ranks as a star of the first magnitude in the history of French symbolism. Van der Vat is justly severe on Poe as a poet (*The Raven*, by now, must have been driven off his perch upon the bust of Pallas in the modern anthologies of English verse) and on the English decadents of the nineties; he is perhaps too partial to Rossetti and Francis Thompson, who, both in their opinions and their poetry are, in different degrees, decidedly derivative. But Van der Vat is more interested in showing the concordance of the aesthetic thought of the poets he studies, than in finding out the sources of their opinions. Denis Saurat, no doubt, would have traced everything to occultism; Van der Vat is content with showing us a line of English and French poets pointing in one direction, like prophets and sibyls, in mediaeval paintings, to the Cross. For sometimes one has the impression that the whole survey has been devised as a *Festschrift* to Croce, and I cannot resist the temptation of rewriting the title as: *The Fabulous Opera, or A Mask of French and English Poets danced at a Dutch kermesse In honour of a great Neapolitan philosopher.*

Rome.

MARIO PRAZ.

*Soziale Lyrik in England, 1880—1914.* Von Dr. EVA WALRAF.  
(Beiträge zur englischen Philologie herausgegeben von Max Förster. Heft XXIV.) 108 pp. Leipzig: Tauchnitz. 1932. R.M. 5.—.

An extraordinarily promising subject has here been treated in so slight and perfunctory a way, that one feels some regret that the task has been undertaken at all. Ever since Cazamian's masterly *Roman social*, which deals with the interrelation of the Spirit of Reform and the Social Novel, the way was open for a continuation carrying the story on to the new century. Such a continuation has here been attempted for the subject of "social" verse written in late Victorian and Edwardian England. The author makes no claim to a full treatment. The poets chosen are: William Morris, Davidson, Binyon, Phillips, Hueffer and Gibson, a rather random selection, the arbitrariness of which is somewhat surprising. A list that includes Morris, who belongs in fact to an older generation, or Hueffer, with a single poem to justify the inclusion, but leaves out Masfield, Davies, D. H. Lawrence (with his early dialect poems) can hardly be considered representative of the period in question.

The main objection must, however, be made to the treatment of the subject. Dr. Walraf is exclusively interested in the subject matter, i.e. the prose substance of "social" poetry and forgets all along that she is dealing with verse. As a result we get endless prose accounts of the "contents" of poems, some of which are not even quite trustworthy, eked out by a few remarks on form, mostly derived from the authorities, among which Fehr's great survey of Nineteenth and Twentieth Century English Literature has been taxed most heavily. It is true that an attempt has been made to interpret the facts. There is a long and intelligent introduction on



social developments and economic changes up to the Eighties. It is unfortunate that it should end there and leave us in the dark for the most important part of the period under review, i.e. the Nineties and the first decade of the century. But then such an account, besides requiring first-hand studies unnecessary in the case of the older and better known phases of social development, would probably have shown that there is no such vital connection between poetry, even "social" poetry and the social conditions of the day as there is between the realistic social novel and the problems of the world it describes. Dr. Walraf's thesis is based on the assumption of such a relation, i.e. on a more or less naturalistic conception of the function of social verse. Her chapter on William Morris contains a refutation of part at least of such a narrow view, in so far as it fails to show the parallelism of Morris's political conceptions and his work as a poet, of which Dr. Walraf speaks. That work, far from reflecting any definite doctrinal point of view, lives in a different world altogether, of which the author of this study notes a few selected facts while disregarding its utopian character as a whole.

The cause of these inconsistencies and shortcomings is to be found in the neglect of form as the fundamental aspect of verse. To give one more instance: Dr. Walraf is unaware of the curious mixture of intellectual unrest and revolt with extreme verbal conservatism and romantic feeling of form in the work of men like Davidson and even of such minor poets as Binyon and Phillips. This contrast is nowhere more obvious than in their "social" verse and might well make one pause and think. Oscar Wilde, one remembers, wrote on "The Soul of Man under Socialism". There is certainly no such clean distinction between "decadent" and realist verse in the Nineties as Dr. Walraf would have it. Both exist side by side in the work of Davidson and of Henley (who, curiously enough, is never mentioned in this study). The interrelation of the two is highly illuminating with regard to the spirit of the Nineties and might have made the subject of a most valuable chapter. Some consideration of the complexity and riddle of Davidson and his decade would have been inevitable if Dr. Walraf had taken the trouble to study the nature and function of "social" verse in the Nineties.

Edwardian England is represented by Wilfrid Wilson Gibson, who receives the fullest and most sympathetic treatment of all the poets here reviewed. No wonder, for in none is the proportion of prose matter greater than in Gibson, who has devoted many years of his life to the patient elaboration of scenes of misery and gloom in endless variation. But even here, where her penetration is greatest and her genuine sympathy can be felt, the author fails to recognise the meaning of Gibson's social verse as poetry. It certainly does not, as Dr. Walraf rather naively seems to think, state so many prose facts of life, taken down with a view to depicting social conditions. The recurrence of certain figures, — the old men or women, the suffering mother, the bride or wife, — the make-up of these scenes according to definite patterns, provincial or suburban, the dialogue even, all show a preconceived idea colouring the facts. They present symbols, the outer features of which seem indeed to be descriptive of circumstances observed in the East End (Gibson is said to have kept a note-book) but whose significance is primarily interior as the expression of a personal and partly philosophical pessimism which was very

widespread at that time. We find it in Gordon Bottomley, and, strangely transformed, in James Elroy Flecker, and, as pity and bathos, in Hodgson, Squire etc. In Gibson it takes the form of a brooding, patient rehearsal of minutely imagined scenes of misery verging often on the melodramatic, not unlike the process by which that other north-country man, Wordsworth, built up the gloomier ones of his early verse stories or parts of the *Excursion*. From Wordsworth derives that slow-moving blank verse, wrongly called "free verse" in this study, which in places is indistinguishable from prose.

St. Gall.

MAX WILDI.

*England, Heute und Morgen.* Von KURT VON STUTTERHEIM.  
315 pp. Berlin: F. A. Herbig. 1937. RM. 6.80.

The writer of this very readable and competent book has considerably lightened the reviewer's task by prefacing his work with a statement of the purpose which it seeks to serve. In this way he has himself laid down the standards by which his work must be judged. The reviewer need not concern himself with the question whether the book comes up to some vague ideal of perfection but solely with the much simpler and easier question of whether it achieves the author's clearly defined purpose. This purpose, as set out in the Preface, is to make modern England comprehensible to modern Germany, "to set up for its guidance some signposts and warnings and to facilitate its understanding of the soul of England".

It may be ungrudgingly admitted that Dr. von Stutterheim has acquitted himself well of this task for which his position as London correspondent of the *Berliner Tageblatt*, to say nothing of his intimate contacts with representative England through his marriage, has eminently fitted him. He brings to the discharge of his self-imposed duty all the best qualities of the resident foreign journalist; an easy lucid style without trappings or affectations, a many-sided knowledge of his subject and a sincere affection for it born of understanding, and an impartial and balanced spirit. Dr. von Stutterheim is neither the would-be Englishman with an exaggerated admiration for the country of his adoption that so many permanent expatriates tend to become, nor the dour and grudging misfit whose residence abroad only serves to strengthen his national prejudices. He is simply an intelligent German, or if I may use an attribute which to me seems still greater praise, a good European living and working in London. It is greatly to be hoped, therefore, that his very fair and often courageous contribution to the cause of international understanding may achieve a wide circulation in the country for which it has been written and which unhappily is so often purposely misinformed on the character of other countries.

The author's praiseworthy desire to present England from a great many different angles in order to achieve the fullest possible understanding, has necessarily led him to cover a wide variety of subjects. Thus his discussion ranges from the English character to debutante-parties, from the political structure to sartorial customs. He has set himself the double task of description and analysis so that his work serves at the same time as a sort

of sociological Baedeker, a guidebook to English customs and institutions, and as a key to the understanding and, what is more important, a just appreciation of these things. Though for those who already have some first-hand knowledge of the subject the purely descriptive parts are necessarily less interesting than the analytical chapters, the former are yet well worth reading. Not only are they often illuminated by delightful touches of quiet humour but they also contain a great deal of clear and concise exposition regarding such frequently misunderstood subjects as local government, the Church, the structure of the English nobility, the agricultural problem, the composition and form of the Empire, and a multitude of others. It is the first two chapters, however, entitled the Englishman and the Englishwoman, which are most interesting from the controversial point of view. In them Dr. von Stutterheim attempts the supremely difficult task of analysing the national character. Though much of what he has to say in this connection has been said before (in itself certainly no reproach to a book like this which must necessarily be eclectic) and much else must remain a matter of opinion based on an accidental and limited range of personal contacts and experience, Dr. von Stutterheim yet succeeds in showing the English from many new and illuminating angles. The basis from which he starts is particularly apt. Describing the change which came over England with the Civil War and the advent of Puritanism, he goes on to give a very profound and concise definition of the strange animal which arose out of that moral and political turmoil, the English gentleman: a "seltsame(s) Gemisch von Rittersum und nüchterner Bürgerlichkeit". In this definition lies the key to many baffling contradictions in the English character. Highly enlightening also is the description of the Englishman's half involuntary, half purposeful limitation of his outlook to what lies this side of eternity, and the strength and weakness of this a-metaphysical attitude towards life: "kein Ewigkeitswind bläst über diese Insel ... Sich zu einem Menschen heranzubilden der mit dem Leben fertig wird, ist des Engländers vornehmstes Ziel. Abhold der Spekulation und der Selbstbetrachtung richtet der Engländer den Blick auf das Leben ... Dieses ... ist der grosse Lehrmeister den er über sich anerkennt. In dieser Schule hat er gelernt der Logik zu misstrauen". It is all very well said.

On the whole there are few statements or judgments in this book to which the impartial observer of English life could take exception. The author is perhaps a bit too lenient in his judgment of modern English architecture, the British film or the merits of the London theatre. But these are after all to a large degree matters of taste and emphasis. A little more space might have been devoted to that irritating but not uninteresting species of Englishman, the "highbrow" or Bloomsburyite, and the role he plays in English life and thought. Some of the author's statements on political questions such as that municipal elections are a good barometer to the state of political opinion in the country at large, or that the annual party conferences play a great part in deciding party policy (true only, I think, of the Labour Party with its strong internal tensions) I find it a little difficult to accept. Similarly there are certain points in the final chapter regarding England's foreign policy which might have been emphasized a little differently and others which might have been elaborated in somewhat greater detail. But here one has to remember that, in view of the special circumstances prevailing in his country, the author had to sail very close



to the wind in dealing with international affairs. With this consideration in mind his exposition of British policy and the motives by which it is guided (especially his defence of English idealism) deserves full appreciation as does also his very able presentation of the double purpose which the present League has come to serve for British statesmanship. It is a pity that the few typographical errors all seem to have concentrated themselves in the English words used in the text ("enemy", "looser", "All Soul College"). This creates the surely groundless suspicion that the author is not sufficiently well acquainted with the language of the country about which he has written so well.

Only one criticism remains. It is the only serious one. The author has not been happy in his choice of a title. "England Today and Tomorrow" raises greater expectations of prognosis (wisely avoided in all but a few pages) than the scant though interesting suggestions about possible future developments would seem to justify.

London.

J. H. HUIZINGA.

---

## Current Literature 1936

### I. Fiction, Poetry and Drama

"Fiction is down, facts are up; of the hundred most widely read books of the moment only one third are novels." So announced one of the leading English literary journals about the middle of the year 1936, and the truth of this assertion is borne out not only by publishers' figures but also by the issues of many libraries. Yet for all this, in the year under review, as in previous years, several thousand works of fiction appeared, but some half dozen stand out prominently as possessing merits above the ordinary.

Foremost amongst these I should place Winifred Holtby's *South Riding* (Collins, 8/—). In many ways it is an unconventional novel; it has no plot in the strict sense of the word, nor is there a hero or heroine. Yet one cannot but be struck by the sense of unity behind the work — but a unity of impression rather than of incident. The *South Riding* will be found in no map of England; it is the name which Miss Holtby gives to the southern part of Yorkshire, where Kingsport, a typical North Country town, is situated, and in Kingsport, as in many other towns of its kind today, great social changes are taking place and great social problems have to be solved. Miss Holtby gives us a picture of these changes and these problems as they affect the life of the individual, and she does it with a sympathy, a skill and an insight that could only come from a close acquaintance with the folk and the district of which she writes. Her method is to take successively a series of extracts, prosaic enough in themselves, from the minute-book of the local Council — records, possibly, of the demolition of a block of insanitary property, of the appointment of a new Headmistress to the girls' High School, or of extensions to the maternity hospital — and then to reveal all that lies behind them: the clash of personalities and interests on

the Council, the petty jealousies and antagonisms amongst the residents, the squalor and the heroism, the tragedy and the comedy in the life of the poor, and the decadence of the landed proprietor. No one who has once read this novel can be in the least doubt as to the author's ability as a writer. She has a keen sense of spiritual values, and about her work there is a breadth of conception all too rare in these days of introspective, psycho-analytical studies. A sense of gloom, even of disgust, it is true, pervades certain incidents, but there is nothing unhealthy about it. Miss Holtby's canvas is a wide one. Altogether there are over a hundred and fifty characters, and there is scarcely a single one, for however brief a period we meet him, that is not individualised. Of course, there are certain figures that stand out prominently above the others. There is, for instance, Councillor Carne, a rather conservative and headstrong landowner; then there is Mrs. Beddows, a Victorian-minded lady who is quite out of touch with modern problems but enjoys Council work for the sake of the prestige it gives her; and there is also Sarah Burton, the young Headmistress of the High School (a fine creation of the author, surely drawn from life), who finds herself constantly in conflict with governors whose ideas on education are hopelessly obsolete. While centring attention upon the individual and his problems, Miss Holtby has, at the same time, created a strikingly vivid picture of a community; she has got behind the lives of the councillors, the aldermen and all whom their activities affect, from the landlord and the tenant-farmer down to the cottagers, the slum-dwellers, the schoolchildren and the teachers. Without being pretentiously "highbrow" the book is a psychological study of all these classes in relation to their environment, and unity is given to the picture by the sense of uncertainty, of conflicting outlooks, of impending change that hangs over it.

Both as poet and as novelist Francis Brett Young has for long occupied a high place among modern English writers. His latest novel *Far Forest* (Heinemann, 8/6) is, like Miss Holtby's work, suffused with local colour, but the story is one of individuals, not of a community, and there is nothing of gloom or of sordidness in it. Perhaps the difference in the tone and the general atmosphere of the two works is symbolised in the contrast between the environments in which they are set. Miss Holtby's is in a bleak, bare, rather forbidding and semi-industrialised district of South Yorkshire, Mr. Brett Young's in the quiet and hospitable Shropshire countryside. *Far Forest* tells the story of a girl, Jenny Hadley, who, brought up on a farm by a rather strict and pious aunt, falls in love with a young fellow from the mining districts of the Midlands. Owing to his ambition to become a schoolmaster, and his devotion to study, they drift apart, and Jenny goes through many years of calamity and sorrow; but finally they are reconciled and marry. The story is beautifully told, in a prose style which is easy and graceful without being either affected or overloaded with figures; it is, in fact, a style which exactly suits the atmosphere. The author has captured the real genius of the countryside in all the varying seasons; with a veritable charm he can describe the forests and the fields, the hop-gardens and the rural lanes, and always he finds just the right word to arouse a feeling of response in the reader. His writing is never tedious, for he knows how to exercise the art of restraint — a saving grace in a novelist. For the descriptive passages alone the book would be notable; but there is also the human element. The characters are not

complex, nor are they, for a modern novel, many in number, but they are drawn with marvellous understanding and insight. There is Jenny herself, her lover David, her aunt Thirza (something of a religious maniac) and the brutal trapper Fred Badger, as well as his gipsy wife. All are real, living figures and part of the countryside itself. In this skilful mingling of scene and character, of nature and humanity one is reminded of the novels of Mary Webb.

Of a very different type from either Miss Holtby's or Mr. Brett Young's work, is Aldous Huxley's *Eyeless in Gaza* (Chatto & Windus, 8/6). With all the encomiums showered upon it when it appeared about the middle of the year the present writer cannot identify himself; but it is a novel which deserves notice, if only for the peculiarity of its structure and the widespread attention it attracted for a few months. It is decidedly not a book for the reader who merely desires a good story well told, or who goes to the novel for intellectual recreation. Many a reader of this type must have thrown it aside as incomprehensible. In many respects it is characteristically "modern". To begin with, it is a very long book (it runs to 620 pages); then there is a great deal of sex, introspection and sensuality in it; sandwiched here and there into the story are passages of pacifist and anti-Fascist propaganda, while the technique, if not quite so free as that of James Joyce, is certainly individual. Instead of giving us a straightforward narrative, Mr. Huxley chooses to recount the story of his hero's life from the year 1902 to the present day, by taking four different epochs and moving, in rather haphazard fashion, from one to the other. We start in 1933; fifty pages later we are back at 1902; shortly after that we jump forward to 1926, only to be taken back before long to 1907. So the author carries us from one period to another and finally leaves us in the year 1935. The point of this method is not very obvious. Of course, it does not present an insuperable difficulty, but it is apt to become annoying and confusing to a reader. Equally annoying is the impressionistic, fragmentary style of writing into which Mr. Huxley sometimes lapses, as well as his tendency to dwell, without any very apparent purpose, upon things which are distasteful and aesthetically revolting. Let it not be imagined, however, that this is an immoral novel. On the contrary, in spite of a rather affected, ostentatious fondness for the indelicate and a certain schoolboyish delight in the indecent that it displays, there is, when all has been taken into account, a balance on the moral side, and there certainly seems no adequate reason for the temporary ban placed upon it by the Australian censor.

Most of the characters depicted are shallow, unpleasant or frankly foolish and worthless; the society which Mr. Huxley creates is an extremely individualist and purely selfish one, bent on the pursuit of pleasure, totally irresponsible and regarding any kind of allegiance to principle as weakness or cowardice. The central figure, Antony Beavis, a spoiled child from birth, takes it for granted that it is right that he should always have his own way, and grows up into a priggish, intolerable, parasitical young man, with every material advantage to make him happy, but lacking in the one essential of spiritual discernment. Morality, honour, decency he spurns as fetters upon the free expression of individuality, and gradually we see his character deteriorate. He even goes to the length of seducing his friend's sweetheart for the sake of a foolish wager, with the result that his friend, a rather neurotic youth, commits suicide. Suddenly Antony is brought to



the realisation of the enormity of his wrong-doing; he begins to see a purpose and an underlying unity behind the topsy-turvy turmoil of life, and from that time the irresponsible existence becomes impossible. So we leave him, dedicating himself to the cause of fathoming the mystery of the universe and humanity's place in it. Here Mr. Huxley seems to be approaching very near to the religious stand-point, perhaps nearer than he has realised, though in view of his frequent satire on religion one is not surprised that he refrains from definitely committing himself. *Eyeless in Gaza* is certainly a book that one should read with thought and care, even if the task does sometimes become a little irksome and distasteful.

J. B. Priestley made his name as a novelist with *The Good Companions*. He has never written anything else quite so good as that, but his latest novel, *They Walk in the City* (Heinemann, 8/6) comes near to it. In many respects Mr. Priestley is the Dickens of the modern age. He epitomises the spirit of the average Englishman of the twentieth century as Dickens did of the nineteenth; his stories, too, have the same air of free, hearty humour, the same spontaneity and inconsequentiality. One feels that there is no particular reason that they should end where they do, for they have no plot in the Aristotelian sense — no beginning, middle and end. Then too, as is so often the case with Dickens, the central figure is frequently but a name; those who really live are the minor characters, who only enter and re-enter for odd moments, but remain clearly imprinted on the memory. Most of these characteristics are to be found in *They Walk in the City*. As the title of the book suggests, the story is concerned with no exceptional type of person and no unusual situation; it has no thesis to expound and attempts to solve no problem. Rather Mr. Priestley's aim is to present to us the life of the average man or woman in a large city or an industrial town; and by "life", of course, he means not merely the outward, but also the inner existence; not merely what people do and say, but also what they feel and think. He writes with an understanding and a sympathy that speaks a depth of experience and a wide contact with humanity. There is both tragedy and comedy in this book; the two are blended together as they so often are in actual life; the author can rejoice with those who rejoice and weep with those who weep, and the result is a mixture of joviality, wistfulness and tenderness such as one is accustomed to associate with the writings of Charles Lamb. Naturally there is a story in the book — the age-long story of two lovers separated by an unfortunate combination of circumstances, who try to find an antidote to their disappointment by losing themselves in the world about them and then finally, after numerous adventures, meet once again. But the story is not of primary importance. What is of significance is the study of human personality, in all its moods, with all its passions and its longings, that emerges from it. And Mr. Priestley has a remarkably keen eye, too, not only for the subtleties of character but also for those of scene and situation. There are descriptive passages in this book — descriptions of a room in a tenement house, of a drab street in an industrial city, of a bedroom in a cheap boarding-house, of a Fascist or a Communist meeting — that are excellent examples of word-painting at its best. They are not long, but the atmosphere is perfect. They are not laboured, there is no straining after effect, yet the effect is there. They have all the essential qualities of an essay in brief. Mr. Priestley, in fact, has never really lost the mark of the essayist; he has an

eye for detail, for the curious, for the unexpected, while he can make a triviality of absorbing interest. That, perhaps, goes largely to account for the unique merits of his novels, as well as for some of their shortcomings.

Another really outstanding novel of the year is A. G. Street's *The Gentleman of the Party* (Faber & Faber, 7/6). To anyone who is familiar with Mr. Street's earlier work and can enjoy a well written story which captures all the essentials of the spirit of rural England, the author's name will be enough to recommend it. It stands in the same class as *The Endless Furrow*, noticed in the survey of fiction of 1934, and like that book traces out the vicissitudes and the changes in the fortunes of a farming community over the last half-century, except that where the earlier work viewed the question from the standpoint of the proprietor, here we see the position through the eyes of the labourer. He it is who is "the gentleman of the party." But the atmosphere and spirit is the same, for in Mr. Street's countryside there is no sharp division between master and worker; the social positions of the two differ widely, it is true, but there is no sense of conflicting interests. The farmer is a father to his family of workers; their fortunes and their well-being are bound up one with the other, and, their aspirations being very few and simple, the labourers are content to accept things as they find them. The scene of the present story is Sutton Manor in Wiltshire, a quiet, uneventful place in 1872 when the book opens; but even there the effects of social changes are gradually felt. The war breaks in upon its serenity and when we leave it in 1936, superficially it is a very different Sutton Manor from that of fifty years earlier. Yet at heart it is still the same, for there is a sense of eternity — something elemental — about the land, that social changes cannot alter. Once again Mr. Street has drawn a most delightful picture of a typical agricultural society. Many are the folk whose lives are bound up with Sutton Manor; our author knows all of them thoroughly and presents them in simple but realistic fashion. They pass through his pages and then disappear; but George Simmons, whom we meet first as a small urchin and leave as an aged herdsman of seventy-three, lives through all the ups and downs and loves the farm as though it were a human companion. He is a finely drawn figure, and stands as a symbol of the unchanging behind the thin veneer of change.

In many respects Charles Morgan's *Sparkenbroke* (Macmillan, 8/6) belongs to an older tradition than any of the foregoing, and has certain characteristics in common with the works of George Meredith. The story, far from being infected by the rush and speed of the modern world, is unfolded in a leisurely fashion; there is a definite philosophical element in the book, the characters are approached from a psychological standpoint, while about Mr. Morgan's prose there is an impressiveness, a cadence and an artistry, a care for diction and expression that was more usual forty or fifty years ago than it is today. It is much more than a mere tale of human relationship or the interplay of character with character, personality with personality; at bottom it is a study of the relation between the inner and the outer in the life of man; the growth and development of spiritual desires and spiritual consciousness and their expression through the reaction of the individual to the universe around him. As would be expected in such a work, there is a good deal of theorising and self-analysis on the part of the characters, and at times we come upon passages where the thought rises to heights of true sublimity. In such cases the author's gift of

expression rarely deserts him; beauty of thought begets beauty of language; the two are inseparable.

The principal figures are only four in number, and Mr. Morgan has taken care to represent them as different types, but in every case the problem involved is essentially the same. First and foremost stands Lord Sparkenbroke, a most ambitious and a most difficult portrait to draw. A scion of an old family of English landed gentry, with a streak of libertinism, dilettantism and poetry in their blood, he is presented as something of a Byronic type, though the present writer cannot feel that as such the picture is always quite convincing. His problem is to reconcile the poet's craving for love, beauty and the ideal, with the world and the men and women amongst whom he has to live. Then there is Mary Leeward, a woman torn between two loves and fidelities and living a dual existence, dividing her life between the work-a-day domestic sphere into which she is forced by circumstances, and a passionate dream-world of her imagination, which sometimes becomes more real to her than her more mundane life. George Hardy, a gentle, sympathetic, common-sense physician, one of the least imaginative and introspective of the characters, is very well drawn; and so is his father, a village rector and tutor to Sparkenbroke in his early years, a most human and engaging pedagogue, with a keen appreciation of literary values whether in the classical or the English writers. One cannot but fall in love with this kindly old scholar, as he rambles on enthusiastically about the merits of Tacitus and Cicero, Johnson, Goldsmith and Swift. He does not play a large part in the story, and yet his influence seems to pervade the whole of Mr. Morgan's writing. Rector Hardy's observations upon the secrets of great style are the author's own observations, and the style of the present work, restrained, clear, precise, melodious, the word well matched to the mood, atmosphere blending with character, stands as evidence that Mr. Morgan is not only a critic and a theorist, but a stylist also; that he can create as well as appreciate.

Foremost amongst the more miscellaneous types of fiction I should put *Collected Short Stories* by Stella Benson (Macmillan, 7/6), a volume containing thirteen stories, varied in character, but all finished literary products and good examples of this kind of writing at its best. It is not always that a novelist, who is used to a more expansive medium of narration, is able to master the art and technique of the short story; but Miss Benson's genius was versatile enough to accomplish that task. There are stories here which are frankly fantasies, stories which are realistic, stories which are mildly satirical and stories which are humorous; and every one bears the mark of the author's consummate artistry. There is a sense of completeness and finish about them, with no kind of clash or incongruity between incident and atmosphere, style and character. In none of them is the stage crowded with figures, but what there are are clearly and convincingly conceived, and in most of them the reader really can believe. In seeking to characterise Miss Benson's art as it appears in this volume one is driven, almost inevitably, to use once again that much overworked word "restraint"; never does she fall into any excess of emotionalism on the one hand or of farcical humour on the other. She feels a broad and kindly sympathy with all her personages, no matter who or of what kind they be, with the result that her stories, characterised by so genial a humanity, gain immensely in credibility and verisimilitude.



The English Association's volume of *Essays of Today* (Oxford University Press, 2/6) is the most recent addition to the series of anthologies of modern literature launched by the Association twenty-one years ago with *Poems of Today*. That it has already gone into a second impression is proof of the widespread attention it has attracted. No doubt faults could be found with it, for the field is a wide one, and the choice of representative essays and essayists is bound to be to a certain extent arbitrary. The editors confess that they have found their task a difficult one, but though individual readers may perhaps feel a regret that their favourite essayist is left out, no one will wish away anything that is included. The volume has not been limited to the essay in the more restricted sense of the word, but includes examples of the review, the leading article, the pamphlet, the biographical sketch and the semi-technical treatise. Forty authors are represented, most of them still living, and both as regards style and interest their essays range over a wide field, from the humour of G. K. Chesterton to the scholarship and academic discussion of Sir Henry Hadow, from the wit of A. P. Herbert or Max Beerbohm to the earnestness of J. B. S. Haldane or Julian Huxley. The modern age, owing to a combination of various circumstances, has probably been more favourable to the essayist than any of its predecessors for the last two hundred years; it has certainly been more productive. Whether the present volume can in any way be called representative it is difficult to say; it is improbable that any single volume could fulfil that function in these days of diversity. But at least something will be found here to suit every taste and every mood; and every piece included is worthy of its place. That, after all, is to be expected in a volume sponsored by the English Association.

In the realm of poetry the year 1936 has much to its credit; indeed, on looking back one wonders whether it was not the most promising in this direction for a considerable time. Several notable "collected editions" have appeared. There are, for instance, *The Poems of James Elroy Flecker* (Martin Secker, 5/—), while *The Poetical Works of Robert Bridges* has been added to the Oxford Standard Authors (Oxford University Press, 3/6). This is not quite a complete edition of the verses written by the late Poet Laureate, for *The Testament of Beauty* is excluded, as are also the eight poetic dramas, but for the rest all the poems will be found here, arranged as they originally appeared in their separate volumes. Any kind of review of Bridges' achievement as a poet would be out of place in this survey, for anything less than a full-length article would be quite inadequate for the consideration of a writer who, though he has not commanded the allegiance of the younger generation, has at least always held their esteem. He has long been recognised as the master-artist of the early twentieth century, combining all that is best in the English literary tradition with the precision and discipline of the classics and a personal fastidiousness of form and diction. It is not impossible that in years to come he may be regarded by criticism as one of the few poets of his day who really matter; meanwhile he has already gained a place amongst the immortals by inclusion in this series.

Another writer of the older generation is represented by *The Poems of Sir William Watson* (Harrap, 7/6). In his own day Watson suffered an unwarrantable neglect, and his works are still not so well known as

they should be, but it is perhaps not too rash to prophesy that future ages will award him an honourable place in the annals of English poetry. The present volume should do much to establish his reputation. Again, it is not a complete edition; much that appeared in the earlier volumes will not be found here, but it includes all that the author (who himself made the selection in the last months before his death) wished to be remembered by, and a number of the poems have never appeared in print before. "While dignity, perspicuity and measure are still recognised", wrote William Archer as long ago as 1899, "Watson will be accounted a landmark of sense and style in an age too apt to go astray in labyrinths of eccentricity, obscurity and excess". That assertion might well have been made after a reading of the present volume. Watson was the child of the nineteenth century. He created no school and he made few converts. Perhaps an excess of self-pity is to be detected here and there in these verses, but their chief characteristics are depth of feeling, sincerity of conviction and a scrupulous regard for the finer graces of style and language. Twice he was passed over for the office of Poet Laureate, and on both occasions there was no one who would have filled it with such dignity and distinction as he. In technique he was essentially conservative and had no patience with the new "free-verse", which he criticised severely in a number of his poems. Perhaps that is why the new generation turned their back on him as a remnant of the Victorian age. The present collection of his poems, it is to be hoped, will, in part at least, atone for past neglect.

T. S. Eliot, a writer of a very different calibre, has also published his *Collected Poems 1909-1935* (Faber & Faber, 7/6). This volume contains all the most memorable of Mr. Eliot's work in verse — though not the poetic play *Murder in the Cathedral* — and therefore should find a place amongst any library of modern English literature. The major poems are arranged in chronological order, starting with *The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock* and ending with *Burnt Norton*; thus it is possible to follow out through the book the evolution of Mr. Eliot's genius. The chief impression that these poems leave is one of continuity in development. Both technically and philosophically there is a difference between the earlier verses and the later, yet it is a change due to growth rather than to an intellectual or aesthetic re-orientation. Stylistically the later verses (to the present writer at least) are the more felicitous. The imagery is less elusive and personal, the language is more direct, and the poet shows more inclination to observe the ordinary rules of syntax. So far as thought and content are concerned, on the other hand, the development is rather in the opposite direction: from cynicism and despair to a kind of religious faith and hope that is essentially individual — so individual, in fact, that all attempts to catch the essentials of its spirit leave one rather in the clouds. In his earlier phase Mr. Eliot is the spokesman of an age of disillusion. He sees post-war Europe, for all its superficial optimism, as a "waste land", a land which has become spiritually bankrupt in its pursuit of the material. With the characteristic aloofness of the satirist, he seems to sit above mankind, smiling grimly and sometimes gnashing his teeth at human folly and blindness. But in these latter days he has descended from that eminence. A new vision has been vouchsafed him, and he comes amongst the people as an evangelist preaching repentance.

The world turns and the world changes,  
 But one thing does not change.  
 In all my years one thing does not change.  
 However you disguise it this thing does not change:  
 The perpetual struggle of Good and Evil.

So, as in his essays, his cry is "Back to Religion", back to the recognition of the moral foundation of the universe and to a sense of personal, moral responsibility. "If humility and purity be not in the heart they are not in the home; and if they are not in the home they are not in the city." Readers may differ as to the merits of Mr. Eliot as a poet. That is a question which only posterity can decide, but poet or not, his influence on modern verse has been so marked that present-day literature cannot be understood without a detailed study of his writings.

Admirers of the modernist school of poetry will also welcome the appearance of *Selected Poems of Edith Sitwell* (Duckworth, 8/6), a volume which contains seventy-five of Miss Sitwell's earlier verses, as well as two important new poems of some length. But the most valuable part of the book is really an introductory essay of almost fifty pages, in which the author defends herself against the charges of obscurity and lack of artistry brought by John Sparrow in his *Sense and Poetry*<sup>1</sup>. Miss Sitwell goes to considerable pains to explain her technique, her imagery and her symbolism, and one must admit that, read in the light of this preface, her poems do become intelligible — or at least, more so than they were before. But does this really constitute a vindication? A poet can hardly blame her would-be readers for branding her as obscure or incomprehensible if her verses consist almost solely of images and symbols so personal that they mean nothing to a reader until he has waded through a long and intricate treatise upon them. Speaking for himself, the present writer has found much more enjoyment in *Selections from the Poems of Dorothy Wellesley* (Macmillan, 5/—), a book consisting mainly of extracts from *Poems of Ten Years*, noticed in this survey for 1934, though some new work has also been included, most notably a poem *Fire*, dedicated to W. B. Yeats, who writes an introduction to the volume. Lady Wellesley shows herself a poet sensitive to colour and sound, able to communicate her experiences and perceptions with a precision of language and felicity of expression. Then, too, in many of her verses there is a strong rhythmical power, which gives vitality to her writing. The range of her subjects is confined for the most part to the field of nature — flowers and animals, woods, brooks and meadows — but she is keenly alive to the beauty of the world around her, and a strong imaginative power finds a deep significance in things seemingly most trivial. The poem *Matrix*, moreover, is proof that there is a philosophical and speculative side to her mind.

Two years ago W. H. Davies published his collected poems. *The Birth of Song* (Cape, 5/—) is a slender volume of the verses which he has written since then — twenty-four in number. They show no diminution of creative power, and upon all of them is stamped that sane, balanced, optimistic outlook upon life that we have come to regard as characteristic of their author. He repines not for the passing of youth or for the ill in the world, for to the old as well as to the young there still remain love, beauty,

<sup>1</sup> See the survey of Biography and Criticism of 1934 in *E. S.*, October 1935.



music and song. The few short pieces here prove that, despite modern fashions in versification, there is still in England at least one true lyricist of the older school. The Poet Laureate's *Letter from Pontus and Other Verses* (Heinemann, 6/—), on the other hand, is rather disappointing. It tells of the life, the longing for home, and the resignation to his fate, of the exiled Ovid; but the treatment too frequently becomes prosaic and the diction often descends to the commonplace. On the whole the "Other Verses" are of a higher quality than the piece which gives its name to the collection.

Far otherwise is it with A. E. Housman's *More Poems* (Cape, 5/—), a selection from his unpublished manuscript verses made, in accordance with the author's directions in his will, by his brother, Laurence Housman. True, they are, as the compiler admits, "mainly workshop material", but they are uniformly good. Many go back to the period of the *Shropshire Lad*, though some are more recent, but every one of them speaks the poet's fastidiousness, care and precision in all that he wrote. The melancholy of the earlier verses appears here once again; so do the Stoicism, the keen appreciation of beauty in the commonplace, the sense of transience and mortality in all earthly things, the sadness over the apparently inexplicable injustices and cruelties of life; and most of all the allegiance to the classic ideals of perfection and form. Housman was sternly self-critical. If all poets were as severe on themselves their reputations would not be diminished, and incidentally the labour of publishing "Remains" would be better rewarded than it often is at present.

(To be concluded)

Sheffield.

FREDERICK T. WOOD.

## Bibliography

### HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM

*William Shakespeare. A Handbook.* By T. M. PARROTT. 266 pp. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1934. \$1.25. Oxford University Press. 1935. 6s. [See Review, Febr. 1936.]

*The Janus of Poets: Being an Essay on the Dramatic Value of Shakspeare's Poetry*, both good and bad. By RICHARD DAVID. Cambridge University Press. 5s.

*Shakespeare's Imagery and what it tells us.* By C. F. E. SPURGEON. xv + 408 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1935. 25/- net. [See Review, August 1936.]

*Shakespeares Bilder. Ihre Entwicklung und ihre Funktionen im dramatischen Werk.* Mit einem Ausblick auf Bild und Gleichnis im elisabethanischen Zeitalter. Von W. CLEMEN. (Bonner Studien zur engl. Philologie, Heft xxvii.) viii + 339 pp. Bonn: Hanstein. 1936. Mk. 12.90. [See Review, August 1936.]

*Style in Shakespeare.* By O. ELTON. Annual Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy. 1936. 29 pp. London: Milford. 1936. 1s. 6d. net. [A review will appear.]

*Shakespeares Cäsarbild.* Von L. MORSBACH. (Studien zur englischen Philologie, herausg. von L. Morsbach. LXXXVII.) 32 pp. Halle: Niemeyer. 1935. M. 1.80. [A review will appear.]

*What Happens in Hamlet.* By J. DOVER WILSON. viii + 334 pp. Cambridge University Press, 1935. 12/6 net. [A review will appear.]

*Der Sinn des Hamlet.* Von L. L. SCHÜCKING. viii + 132 pp. Leipzig: Quelle und Meyer. 1935. RM. 3.40. [A review will appear.]

*Hamlets Flucht in den Tod.* Von R. FLATTER. 88 pp. Wien, Leipzig und Zürich: Reichner.

*Hamlet the Man.* By ELMER EDGAR STOLL. (The English Association Pamphlets, No. 91.) Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 2s. 6d.

*Shakespeares Macbeth als Drama des Barock.* Von M. DEUTSCHBEIN. iv + 130 pp. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer. 1936. Geb. RM. 6.—; Leinw. RM. 7.—. [A review will appear.]

*Shakespeare's Sonnets.* Edited by TUCKER BROOKE. vi + 346 pp. London, New York: Oxford University Press. 1936. 21s. net. [A review will appear.]

*The Sonnets of Shakespeare. A Psycho-Sexual Analysis.* By H. MCCLURE YOUNG. 121 pp. Author: 217 Exchange National Bank Building, Columbia, Missouri. 1937. \$ 2.00. [A review will appear.]

*The Theme of Revenge in Elizabethan Tragedy.* By P. SIMPSON. Annual Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy, 1935. 38 pp. London: Milford. 1935. 2/6 net. [See Review, August 1936.]

*Ben Jonson on the English Stage, 1660-1776.* By R. G. NOYES. 351 pp. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press. London: Milford. 1936. 15s.

*The Jacobean Drama. An Interpretation.* By U. M. ELLIS-FERMOR. xv + 336 pp. London: Methuen. 1930. 12s. 6d. net. [See Review, August 1936.]

*John Ford.* By M. JOAN SARGEANT. 232 pp. Oxford: Blackwell. 1935. 12s. 6d. [See Review, April 1936.]

*Das Schauspiel der englischen Komödianten in Deutschland.* Seine dramatische Form und seine Entwicklung. Von A. BAESECKE. (Studien zur englischen Philologie, LXXXVII.) xiii + 154 pp. Halle: Niemeyer. 1935. RM. 6.50. [See Review, Dec. 1936.]

*The Overburian Characters.* To which is added *A Wife.* By SIR THOMAS OVERBURY. Edited by W. J. PAYLOR. (The Percy Reprints, XIII.) xxxiv + 157 pp. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1936. 8s. 6d. net. [A review will appear.]

*Literary Relations of England and Scandinavia in the Seventeenth Century.* By E. SEATON. (Oxford Studies in Modern Languages and Literature. General Editor: Professor H. G. Fiedler.) xv + 384 pp. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1935. 15/— net. [See Review, Febr. 1937.]

*English Poetry of the 17th Century.* Edited by R. F. BRINKLEY. xvi + 584 pp. New York: Norton.

*Milton.* By H. BELLOC. 336 pp. London: Cassell. 12/6 net.

*Milton and Wordsworth. Poets and Prophets.* A Study of their Reactions to Political Events. x + 185 pp. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1937. 8s. 6d. net. [See Review.]

*Der Einfluss Jakob Böhmes auf die englische Literatur des 17. Jahrhunderts.* Von W. STRUCK. (Neue Deutsche Forschungen, Abt. Englische Philologie, Band 6.) 262 pp. 8°. Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt Verlag. 1936. RM. 10.—. [A review will appear.]

*Der typisch puritanische Ideengehalt in Bunyans "Life and Death of Mr. Badman".* Von W. SACHS. 95 pp. Diss. Leipzig. 1936. [A review will appear.]

*Joseph Glanvill, ein spekulativer Denker im England des xvii. Jahrhunderts.* Eine Studie über das frühwissenschaftliche Weltbild. Von H. HABICHT. 183 pp. Zürich. 1936. [A review will appear.]

Zürich diss.

*The Puritan Pronaos.* Studies in the intellectual life of New England in the 17th century. By S. E. MORISON. London: Milford. 1936. 16s. net.

*The Sources of John Dryden's Comedies.* By N. B. ALLEN. (University of Michigan Publications, Language and Literature, XVI.) xvii + 298 pp. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 1935. \$ 3.00. [A review will appear.]

*Alexander Pope.* By EDITH SITWELL. (The Rose and Crown Library, No. 8.) Faber and Faber. 5s.

*Der Aufgeklärte Puritanismus Daniel Defoes.* Von R. STAMM. (Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, 1.) 343 pp. Zürich: Niehans. 1936. Geh. Fr. 15.—, RM. 12.70. [See Review, Febr. 1937.]

*Ancients and Moderns. A Study of the Background of the Battle of the Books.* By R. F. JONES. (Washington University Studies, New Series, Language and Literature, No. 6.) xi + 358 pp. St. Louis. 1936. \$3.—. [A review will appear.]

*James Thomson's Influence on Swedish Literature in the Eighteenth Century.* By W. G. JOHNSON. (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. XIX, Nos. 3-4.) 202 pp. Urbana: University of Illinois. 1936. \$2.50. [A review will appear.]

*Richardson und Fielding. Geschichte ihres Ruhms. Literarsoziologischer Versuch.* Von H. RONTE. (Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten, 25. Band.) 217 pp. Leipzig: Tauchnitz. 1935. RM. 7.—. [A review will appear.]

*The Publication of English Literature in Germany in the Eighteenth Century.* By M. P. PRICE and L. M. PRICE. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, vol. 17.) pp. i-viii + 1-288. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press. 1934. Price: cloth, \$3.50; paper, \$3.00. [See Review, Oct. 1936.]

*The Sublime: A Study of Critical Theories in xviii-Century England.* By S. H. MONK. vii + 252 pp. New York: Modern Language Association of America. 1935. [See Review, Oct. 1936.]

*Topographical Poetry in XVIII-Century England.* By R. A. AUBIN. (The Modern Language Association of America, Revolving Fund Series, VI.) xii + 419 pp. New York: The Modern Language Association of America. London: Milford. 1936. 16/— net. [A review will appear.]

*Jewish Characters in Eighteenth Century English Fiction and Drama.* By H. R. S. VAN DER VEEN. 308 pp. Groningen: Wolters. 1935. f 4.90. [See Review, Dec. 1935.]

Groningen diss.

*Die Lyrik und ihr Publikum im England des 18. Jahrhunderts.* Von V. LANGE. (Literatur und Leben, 2. Band). 117 pp. Weimar: Verlag Hermann Böhlaus Nachf. 1935. RM. 4.50. [A review will appear.]

*Thomas Gray.* By R. W. KETTON-CREMER. (Great Lives Series.) Duckworth. 2s.

*Poor Collins. His Life, His Art, and His Influence.* By E. G. AINSWORTH. x + 340 pp. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press. London: Milford. 1937. 15s. net. [A review will appear.]

*Thomas Chatterton und seine Rowley-Dichtung Untersucht auf Grund der Psychologie der Reifezeit.* (Bonner Studien zur Englischen Philologie, XXIV.) Von P. STAUBERT. 162 pp. Bonn: Hanstein. 1935. M. 6.60. [A review will appear.]

*Blake and Milton.* By D. SAURAT. Stanley Nott. 5s.

*William Blake. Versuch einer Entwicklungsgeschichte des Mystikers.* Von W. BAGDASARIANZ. (Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, 2.) 171 pp. Zürich: Niehans. 1936. Geh. Fr. 6.50, RM. 5.50. [See Review.]

*Laurence Sterne und sein Einfluss auf die englische Prosa des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts.* Von F. BEHRMANN. 141 pp. Zürich. 1936. [A review will appear.]

Zürich diss.

*Nederland en Shakespeare. Achttiende Eeuw en Vroege Romantiek.* Door DR. R. PENNINK. viii + 304 pp. 's-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff. 1936. f 5.—, geb. f 6.50. [A review will appear.]

Utrecht diss.

*Lessing's Relation to the English Language and Literature.* By C. C. D. VAIL. (Columbia University Germanic Studies, New Series, No. 3.) vi + 220 pp. New York: Columbia University Press. London: Milford. 1936. 15s. net. [A review will appear.]



## Paternity in Ulysses

In the middle of what is perhaps the most enthralling episode of *Ulysses*, the quaker librarian remarks tritely: "The mocker is never taken seriously when he is most serious." In this subtle way Joyce warns the reader not to make light of the seeming irrelevance and flippancy of many passages of *Ulysses*. For *Ulysses* contains not one superfluous word, and obscenities and blasphemies become of dramatic importance if viewed in their proper perspective. But the author, being a pure poet, never interferes with the purity of his work by intruding upon the life of his own creation in order to warn the reader of the importance of a scene, a character or a mere word. Joyce observes his own rules explained in *The Portrait* and, after finishing his creation, the creator stands apart 'paring his fingernails', leaving his work to speak for itself, 'sans voix d'auteur'. The reader, therefore, who passes by a word on one page will soon be bewildered, because every word has a life of its own and goes on growing till it runs amuck in the fugues of the *Sirens* or the pandemonium of *Circe*. It is therefore quite characteristic of Joyce that he should introduce the main theme of *Ulysses* by means of a blasphemy falling from the lips of the irrepressible Mulligan, Malachi of the brood of mockers. Stephen, Haines, and Mulligan are about to have breakfast. The eggs are ready to be served and Mulligan exclaims: "Here, I cannot go fumbling at the damned eggs. He hacked through the fry on the dish and slapped it on the three plates saying: *In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti*." <sup>1</sup> The casual reader relying on his routine will consider this use of the formula of the Cross as no more than a blasphemy and pass on unconscious of the fact that he has missed the introduction to the main theme of *Ulysses*. For it is in this unobtrusive way that Joyce tells the reader that *Ulysses* was written in the name of a Sonless Father, a Fatherless Son and the Spirit of Frustration, the ghost of antler-headed Shakespeare.

*Ulysses* is framed on the *Odyssey*. It deals with a son in search of a father <sup>2</sup> (Stephen-Telemachos) and with a wanderer away from his home (Bloom-Odysseus) <sup>3</sup>. The very choice of the *Odyssey* as a frame stresses the importance of the father-son theme. But the Odysseus-Telemachos parallel is not the only one, though it is undoubtedly the most important. Already in the first episode (*Telemachos*) there is a reference to another father-son mystery, namely the mystical relationship between God the Father and Christ. Arius is mentioned 'warring his life long upon the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father' and Valentine and Sabellius, all of them heretics philosophizing on the same mystery. This theological parallel also runs through the whole of *Ulysses* and words as consub-

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ulysses* by James Joyce. The Odyssey Press. Hamburg-Paris-Bologna. p. 15. Compare the passage in *Aeolus*, p. 139. The editor is trying to persuade Stephen to write an article for the *Freeman*. "Give them something with a bite in it. Put us all into it, damn its soul. Father Son and Holy Ghost and Jakes McCarthy."

<sup>2</sup> Cp. p. 6. Mulligan says to Stephen: "Your absurd name, an ancient Greek."

<sup>3</sup> Mulligan speaking to Stephen says of Bloom: "O, I fear me, he is Greeker than the Greeks." p. 207.

stantial', 'consubstantiality', 'subsubstantiality' etc. occur frequently. Far more important than the former is the parallel Shakespeare-Hamnet to which practically the whole of the beautiful *Scylla and Charybdis* episode is devoted. Two more parallels mentioned in passing are Abraham-Nathan and, humorously, Dumas père-Dumas fils. The latter is one of the mild mockeries that hide far more than the casual reader would guess. It is the purpose of the present article to pursue the fatherhood motive through all its ramifications and to serve as an exegesis and a guide through the bewildering maze of the greatest piece of prose ever written.

It will first deal with '*the Son*', '*the Father*' and '*the Ghost*' and then trace the signs of a constant '*spiritual communion*' between the protagonists. It concludes with the '*meetings in the flesh*'.

THE SON. Though Stephen Dedalus is presented to us as a son in quest of a father,<sup>4</sup> he is not fatherless in the real sense of the word. His father, Simon Dedalus, is very much alive and in the *Sirens* he is shown singing *M'appari* to a small but appreciative audience. He is also one of the prominent figures in *Hades*. He impresses one as a weak but thoroughly lovable man, irresponsible, fond of song, and too fond of spirits. He is very proud of his son, but wisely keeps apart from him. Stephen's keen mind has torn the myth of bodily fatherhood to pieces. "What links them in nature? An instant of blind rut."<sup>5</sup> "A father, Stephen said, battling against hopelessness, is a necessary evil .... Fatherhood in the sense of conscious begetting is unknown to man. It is a mystical estate, an apostolic succession, from only begetter to only begotten .... Paternity may be a legal fiction. Who is the father of any son that any son should love him or he any son? .... The son unborn mars beauty: born, he brings pain, divides affection, increases care. He is a male: His growth is his father's decline, his youth his father's envy, his friend his father's enemy."<sup>6</sup> Filial and fatherly love are myths. Even the decalogue does not exact love. Now Stephen possesses an absolute integrity. At the deathbed of his mother he refused to comfort her in her last moments with a satanical courage. It is the same merciless integrity which prompts him not to behave as if he still believed in the myth of filial love. In *Eumaeus* the boasting sailor has heard Stephen's name. "You know Simon Dedalus? he asked at length. — I've heard of him, Stephen said."<sup>7</sup> Who indeed is the son of any father that any father should love him or he any father? Even easygoing Simon Dedalus shares this conviction subconsciously. It is true that he has a strain of patriarchal superstition left in him. He objects to his son's friendship with Mulligan ('his friend his father's enemy'). "I won't have her bastard of a nephew ruin my son".<sup>8</sup> But when in the *Sirens* Lenehan says to him: "Greetings from the famous son of a famous father", Mr. Dedalus asks: "Who may he be?" "Lenehan opened most genial arms. Who? — Who may he be? he asked. Can you ask? Stephen, the youthful

<sup>4</sup> Cp. p. 21. Mulligan exclaims: "O, shade of Kinch the elder! Japhet in search of a father!"

<sup>5</sup> p. 215.

<sup>6</sup> p. 214.

<sup>7</sup> p. 616.

<sup>8</sup> p. 91.

bard.”<sup>9</sup> So even the father shows himself to be a wise man. In his racy language he makes another remark on the relationship between father and son. He wonders where Stephen is staying and says with a sneer: “Down with his aunt Sally, I suppose, ... the Goulding faction, the drunken little costdrawer and Crissie papa’s little lump of dung, the wise child that knows her own father.”<sup>10</sup>

Fatherhood then to Stephen is a fatality. The father is as much a victim of fatherhood as the son. Meditating on birth Stephen says to himself: “Wombed in sin darkness I was too, made not begotten. By them the man with my voice and my eyes and a ghostwoman with ashes on her breath. They clasped and sundered, did the coupler’s will. From before the ages He willed me and now may not will me away or ever. A *lex eterna* stays about Him. Is that then the divine substance wherein Father and Son are consubstantial?”<sup>11</sup> Submission, therefore, to patriarchal presumption and family ties (brothers who are as easily forgotten as umbrellas, a ghostwoman with ashes on her breath) is one of the nightmares, like history, from which Stephen is trying to awake. Bloom, the *fidus Achates* in *Eumaeus*, says: “I don’t mean to presume to dictate to you in the slightest degree but why did you leave your father’s house?” “To seek misfortune”<sup>12</sup>, is Stephen’s answer. Rather experience unhappiness for the sake of a supposed spiritual reality than enjoy happiness based on an illusion. It is obvious that such metaphysical integrity can only be bought at the expense of an unceasing struggle with the human heart. In the midst of Stephen’s passionate ‘lecture’ on Shakespeare, while his keen wits divest bodily fatherhood of all its shabby glory, his troubled heart rebels for a short moment. “I touched his hand. The voice, new warmth speaking .... The eyes that wish me well. But do not know me.”<sup>13</sup> (If the child cannot know its own father according to father Dedalus, the father cannot know his own child according to Dedalus son). But Stephen’s mind is wary. For it is after this moment of weakness that he, ‘battling against hopelessness’, proclaims any father a necessary evil. When in *Circe* physical degradation oppresses Stephen, the heart once more rebels against the ruthless mind: “Play with your eyes shut. Imitate pa. Filling my belly with husks of swine. Too much of this. I will arise and go to my.” But before his lips can betray the anxiety of his heart by uttering the forbidden word, the mind interferes lest the world should be burdened with the shame of another prodigal son.

Who then could be the father of this desperate son, a man linked to his offspring by more than a moment of wild rut? We know it already from the *Portrait* which ends with the words: “Old father, old artificer, stand me now and ever in good stead.” Stephen prefers the purity of a legendary past to the physical squalor and sentimentality of a filial illusion. If Stephen recoils from Simon, let Dedalus once more be Icarus’ father. It is the old artificer to whom Stephen appeals: “Fabulous artificer, the hawklike man. You flew. Where to? Newhaven-Dieppe, steerage passenger. Paris and back. Lapwing. Icarus. *Pater ait*. Seabedabbled,

<sup>9</sup> p. 271.

<sup>10</sup> p. 91.

<sup>11</sup> p. 41.

<sup>12</sup> p. 612.

<sup>13</sup> p. 214.



fallen, weltering. Lapwing you are. Lapwing he."<sup>14</sup> It is the son choosing his own loneliness instead of having it thrust upon him. For this appeal to and this memory of an older Dedalus is nothing but a confession of loneliness. Frustration is turned into a deliberate abnegation. The son in quest of a father gives up all his illusions. And the most tragic words uttered by Stephen in *Ulysses* are those in the *Oxen of the Sun* when he calls himself 'the eternal son'.<sup>15</sup>

THE FATHER. Stephen is the son who banished his own (living) father from his heart that the mind might be free to choose its own father. If we now turn to the other protagonist of *Ulysses*, Leopold Bloom, the wandering Jew, the pathetic frustrated grandson of Odysseus, we see in him the father in quest of a son. But here we have not a Dedalus looking for an Icarus, but a Jew with all the family pride and family affection of his race desiring a son, a physical descendant. It is not a mind that has freed itself from sentimentality and filial superstition to link itself to another mind; it is a male body desiring male issue. It is Stephen's tragedy that nature intrudes upon the privacy of his proud mind. It is Bloom's tragedy that nature has left him in the lurch. Stephen has flung the filial illusion away from him; Bloom would have been only too willing to sacrifice himself to the illusion of fatherhood, an illusion which to this baffled father is the only physical reality. Stephen belongs to the lonely of mind, but Bloom to the lonely of heart.

Bloom, the husband of Tweedy's daughter, Marion (pride of Kalpe's rock), has a daughter, Milly. He also had a son Rudy who died eleven days after his birth. The memory of this son haunts his thoughts. Seeing Simon Dedalus he muses: "Noisy selfwilled man. Full of his son. He is right. Something to hand on. If little Rudy had lived. See him grow up. Hear his voice in the house. Walking beside Molly in an Eton suit. My son. Me in his eyes. Strange feeling it would be. From me.... My son inside her. I could have helped him on in life. I could. Make him independent. Learn German too."<sup>16</sup> Here a patriarch betrays all the sentimentality, all the self-deceit and all the illusions of the very fatherhood which Stephen abhors. After eleven years Bloom cannot forgive nature for having robbed him of the only thing worth living for, a son. Thinking of Victoria he says: "her son was the substance. Something new to hope for...." In *Cyclops* Ned Lambert refers to Bloom's pathetic pride just before Rudy was born: "O, by God, says Ned, you should have seen Bloom before that son of his that died was born. I met him one day in the south city markets buying a tin of Neave's food six weeks before the wife was delivered."<sup>17</sup> In the *Oxen of the Sun* we see Bloom in the maternity hospital. He is waiting full of compassion for the delivery of Mrs. Purefoy. He is thinking of Rudy's birth: "But sir Leopold was passing grave maugre his word by cause of the terrorcausing shrieking of shrill women in their labour and he was minded of his good lady Marion that had borne him an only manchild which on his eleventh day on live had

---

<sup>14</sup> p. 217.

<sup>15</sup> p. 411.

<sup>16</sup> p. 92.

<sup>17</sup> p. 351.

died and no man of art could save so dark is destiny." <sup>18</sup> And he is haunted by the memory of the small corpse. In *Hades* they see the funeral of a baby. "Sad, Martin Cunningham said. A child. A dwarf's face mauve and wrinkled like little Rudy's was. Dwarf's body, weak as putty, in a whitelined deal box. Burial friendly society pays. Penny a week for a sod of turf. Our. Little. Beggar. Baby. Meant nothing. Mistake of nature." <sup>19</sup> The atmosphere of ruthless intellectual integrity in which Stephen meditates on fatherhood has made place for Bloom's pathetic ineffectual ponderings. "No, Leopold! Name and memory solace thee not. That youthful illusion of thy strength was taken from thee and in vain. No son of thy loins is by thee. There is none to be for Leopold, what Leopold was for Rudolph." <sup>20</sup> Stephen succeeded in rising above frustration, whereas Bloom has been overpowered by it, helpless, defenceless, and full of self-pity. Listening to Ben Dollard's (trenchant) rendering of *The Croppy Boy*, Bloom broods over his sorrow: "last of his name and race. I too, last my race. Milly young student. Well, my fault perhaps. No son. Rudy. Too late now. Or if not? If not? If still? He bore no hate. Hate. Love. Those are names. Rudy. Soon I am old." <sup>21</sup> And as if this heartache and wretchedness were not enough, life even humiliated him in public with his own fatherly desolation: "Once at a performance of Albert Hengler's circus in the Rotunda, Rutland square, Dublin, an intuitive particoloured clown in quest of paternity had penetrated from the ring to a place in the auditorium where Bloom, solitary, was seated and had publicly declared that he (Bloom) was his (the clown's) papa." <sup>22</sup> The yearning for a son never leaves Bloom. In the company of Stephen and his friends in the maternity hospital he sadly thinks of his loneliness and looking round he imagines that those young fellows might have been his sons. He might have had a son 'of gentle parts' like Stephen. And all life is willing to concede to him is the distressing vision at the end of *Circe*. While Bloom is standing guard over Stephen outside the brothel, he sees Rudy: "(Silent, thoughtful, alert, he stands on guard, his fingers at his lips in the attitude of secret master. Against the dark wall a figure appears slowly, a fairy boy of eleven, a changeling, kidnapped, dressed in an Eton suit with glass shoes and a little bronze helmet, holding a book in his hand. He reads from right to left inaudibly, smiling, kissing the page). BLOOM (wonderstruck, calls inaudibly): Rudy! RUDY (gazes unseeing into Bloom's eyes and goes on reading, kissing, smiling...)" <sup>23</sup>

**THE GHOST.** The third person in this trinity of frustration is William Shakespeare. In *Scylla and Charybdis* Stephen puts forward a theory of his own about Shakespeare and *Hamlet*, a theory in which he does not believe himself. But though we possess no evidence which would enable us to accept this theory as a solution of a literary problem, we must certainly accept it as the most important part of *Ulysses* in so far as the main theme is concerned. As we have seen, Stephen is the son in search

<sup>18</sup> p. 409.

<sup>19</sup> p. 99.

<sup>20</sup> p. 434. Rudolph is the father of Leopold Bloom.

<sup>21</sup> p. 295.

<sup>22</sup> p. 696 cp. note 68.

<sup>23</sup> p. 604.

of a spiritual father, Bloom the father in quest of a bodily son. Now the ghost of Shakespeare is the third person of this triad, the spirit in which father and son become one.<sup>24</sup>

"The play begins. A player comes on under the shadow, made up in the castoff mail of a court buck, a wellset man with a bass voice. It is the ghost, the king, a king and no king, and the player is Shakespeare who has studied Hamlet all the years of his life which were not vanity in order to play the part of the spectre. He speaks the words to Burbage, the young player who stands before him beyond the rack of cerecloth, calling him by a name:

*Hamlet, I am thy father's spirit*

bidding him list. To a son he speaks, the son of his soul, the prince, young Hamlet and to the son of his body, Hamnet Shakespeare, who has died in Stratford that his namesake may live for ever."<sup>25</sup>

So we are shown a spiritual father (the author Shakespeare) addressing his spiritual son, Hamlet of Denmark, and at the same time a bodily father speaking to the ghost of his bodily son, Hamnet Shakespeare. In other words the anguish and frustration underlying *Hamlet* are the anguish and frustration that burden the hearts of Bloom and Stephen. To Stephen Shakespeare is a might-have-been like the legendary Dedalus, to Bloom Shakespeare's son is a might-have-been like Rudy. Hence the obvious parallel: Shakespeare-Bloom and Hamlet-Stephen. That this parallel, or these parallels are intentional appears from other passages in *Ulysses*. Stephen's theory about Shakespeare and *Hamlet* centres round the fact that Shakespeare was made a cuckold by Anne Hathaway. On Bloomsday at four o'clock in the afternoon Bloom meets with the same fate at the hands of his wife, Marion. Bloom's and Marion's bed is a secondhand bed. Shakespeare left his wife his secondbest bed. Curiously enough this link between Bloom and Shakespeare is stressed by the words of Bella Cohen in *Circe* when she says to Bloom: "You have made your secondbest bed and others must lie in it."<sup>26</sup> Further confirmation is contained in the passage where Stephen gives it as his opinion that Shakespeare was seduced by his future wife in a cornfield. He is immediately corrected by Mr. Best: "Ryefield, Mr. Best said brightly, gladly .... He murmured then with blond delight for all:

*"Between the acres of the rye  
These pretty countryfolk would lie."*<sup>27</sup>

And a few minutes afterwards we hear Stephen say: "He was overborne in a cornfield first (ryefield I should say) ..." <sup>28</sup> The reference to the rye is therefore repeated twice in connection with Shakespeare and the reference is stressed by the corrections of Mr. Best and of Stephen himself.

---

<sup>24</sup> cp. Mulligan on p. 215: "Himself his own father...." Critics of Joyce seem to have overlooked this Stephen-Bloom-Shakespeare trinity. There is of course the other trinity: Intuition (Stephen the artist) — Intellect (Bloom) — Body (Marion). But the former is equally important.

<sup>25</sup> p. 194.

<sup>26</sup> p. 550.

<sup>27</sup> p. 197.

<sup>28</sup> p. 202.



A similar remark is made in connection with Bloom. He is seen buying a book by M'Coy: "Wonder what he is buying, M'Coy said, glancing behind. — *Leopoldo or the Bloom is on the Rye*, Lenehan said." <sup>29</sup> And in the *Sirens* in the exposition of the fugue we read: "Blew. Blue Bloom is on the." <sup>30</sup> Further on in the fugue this theme is expanded into: "Bloom. Old Bloom. Blue Bloom is on the rye." <sup>31</sup> There is still another link. In *Scylla and Charybdis* Stephen remarks of Shakespeare: "The note of banishment from the heart, banishment from home, sounds uninterruptedly from *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* onward till *Prospero* breaks his staff." <sup>32</sup> Bloom too is banished from his home while the usurper, Blazes Boylan, has taken possession of his secondhand bed. And he is an exile in Dublin where he is pursued by hate and ridicule. Through his multitudinous musings play the memories of eastern lands. Another reference to Shakespeare which constitutes a link with Bloom is to be found in *Scylla and Charybdis* when Stephen says: "As we, or mother Dana, weave and unweave our bodies from day to day, their molecules shuttled to and fro, so does the artist weave and unweave his image. And as the mole on my right breast is where it was when I was born, though all my body has been woven of new stuff time after time, so through the ghost of the unquiet father the image of the unliving son looks forth." <sup>33</sup> The unquiet father is of course both Shakespeare and Bloom; the unliving son both Hamnet and Rudy.

The parallel Stephen-Hamlet is obvious. And Joyce takes care that this parallel should be impressed upon the reader. Mr. Best has told his audience that Mallarmé in one of his prose-poems relates how a performance of *Hamlet* was advertised in a French town, namely as *Hamlet ou Le Distrain*. *Pièce de Shakespeare*. <sup>34</sup> When Stephen hears this he translates this subtitle as "the absentminded beggar". Afterwards in *Circe* Bloom returns the poundnote to Stephen saying: "This is yours." To which Stephen answers: "How is that? *Le distraint* or absentminded beggar." <sup>35</sup> In *Proteus* Stephen says of himself: "So in the moon's midwatches I pace the path above the rocks, in sable silvered, hearing Elsinore's tempting flood." <sup>36</sup> Another link between Stephen and Hamlet deserves mention. In *Proteus* Stephen plays with the idea of paying a visit to his aunt Sara who is married to his uncle Richard. In this passage the aunt is referred to as "Papa's little bedpal. Lump of love." <sup>37</sup> The importance of this link is duly stressed by a remark of Simon Dedalus in *Hades*. "Down with his aunt Sally, I suppose, Mr. Dedalus said. the Goulding faction, the drunken little costdrawer and Crissie, papa's little lump of dung, the wise child that knows her own father." <sup>38</sup> Like Stephen, Hamlet also had an

---

<sup>29</sup> p. 241.

<sup>30</sup> p. 264.

<sup>31</sup> p. 270.

<sup>32</sup> p. 219.

<sup>33</sup> p. 200.

<sup>34</sup> p. 193.

<sup>35</sup> p. 562.

<sup>36</sup> p. 48.

<sup>37</sup> p. 42-43.

<sup>38</sup> p. 91.

uncle Richard, Shakespeare's third brother.<sup>39</sup> Of this Richard Stephen asserts that he was hated by Shakespeare and that the latter vented his hate on Richard's namesake in the play. "Of all his kings Richard is the only king unshielded by Shakespeare's reverence."<sup>40</sup> So Hamlet's father hates Hamlet's uncle Richard just as Stephen's father hates Stephen's uncle Richard. (Be it mentioned in passing that Shakespeare's parallel, Bloom, is brought together with Richard Goulding in the course of Bloomsday, and that he despises him). When speaking of Hamlet's uncle, Stephen uses similar words to the ones with which earlier in the day Simon Dedalus referred to Stephen's uncle: "Lizzie, grandpa's lump of love, and nuncle Richie, the bad man ...."<sup>41</sup> One more direct link between Stephen and Hamlet must be mentioned here. In *Proteus* Stephen ruminates: "Proudly walking. Whom were you trying to walk like? Forget: a dispossessed."<sup>42</sup> This 'dispossessed' is identified with Hamlet, 'the dispossessed son'<sup>43</sup> in *Scylla and Charybdis*.

Now what is the significance of the relationship between Shakespeare and Hamlet (Hamnet) in connection with the fatherhood theme in *Ulysses*? We find the answer to this question in *Scylla and Charybdis*. "John Eglinton summed up. — The truth is midway, he affirmed. He is the ghost and the prince. He is all in all. — He is, Stephen said. The boy of act one is the mature man of act five. All in all. In *Cymbeline*, in *Othello* he is bawd and cuckold. He acts and is acted on."<sup>44</sup> In other words, in Shakespeare father and son become one. The despair of the fatherless son, Hamlet, and the anguish of the sonless father, Shakespeare, are allayed by the beauty of pure poetry. The son Stephen and the father Bloom become one in the ghost of Shakespeare.

**SPIRITUAL COMMUNION.** The father and the son, two wanderers through Bloomsday, united by a mystical relationship in the ghost of Shakespeare, are destined to meet each other in the flesh. Before they meet, however, there is a sort of spiritual communion between them. Similar things happen to them and similar thoughts people their private meditations. We know already that Stephen was extremely preoccupied with Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. The whole of *Scylla and Charybdis* is practically taken up by Stephen's theorizing on the subject. Bloom, who of course knows nothing of Stephen's interest in *Hamlet*, quotes *Hamlet* at least four times. In the *Lestrygonians* we find: "Method in his madness".<sup>45</sup> In the same episode a passage occurs in which Bloom, meditating on poetry, quotes the same sentence which is quoted by Stephen in the library: "That is how poets write, the similar sounds. But then Shakespeare has no rhymes: blank verse. The flow of the language it is. The thoughts. Solemn.

<sup>39</sup> Stuart Gilbert (*James Joyce's Ulysses*. Faber & Faber, 1930, p. 217) speaks of a William Shakespeare-Stephen Dedalus correspondence. There can be no question of such a correspondence.

<sup>40</sup> p. 218-219.

<sup>41</sup> p. 220.

<sup>42</sup> p. 45.

<sup>43</sup> p. 194.

<sup>44</sup> p. 219.

<sup>45</sup> p. 164.

*Hamlet, I am thy father's spirit  
Doomed for a certain time to walk the earth."*

In *Circe Bloom* quotes: "To be or not to be"<sup>47</sup> and in *Nausicaa*: "For this relief much thanks. In *Hamlet* that is."<sup>48</sup> Finally, when Stephen and Bloom have met, the latter refers to *Hamlet* and Bacon.<sup>49</sup>

Another symbol which connects Bloom and Stephen is a key. After leaving the Martello tower in the morning Mulligan goes for a swim. He undresses on the shore and asks Stephen for the heavy key of the tower (a key which has been mentioned several times already in the first episode) in order to keep his shirt from being blown away by the wind. Stephen surrenders the key knowing quite well that Mulligan has asked for the key to do Stephen out of his dwelling and Stephen decides then and there not to return to the tower any more, thus leaving his home to a 'usurper' just as Bloom will be leaving his home to the usurper Blazes Boylan. Bloom on leaving his house in the morning forgets his latchkey and at night he 'a competent keyless citizen'<sup>50</sup> has to gain admittance into his own house by climbing over the area railings. The key symbol is impressed upon the reader's mind by Bloom's long hunt after an advertisement for the House of Keyes. In this ad a symbol is to be used consisting of two crossed keys. Curiously enough Bloom visits the offices of the *Freeman Journal* for this advertisement at the very moment when Stephen happens to be there. They do not actually meet, but Bloom, a keyless citizen, hunting for a symbol of two crossed keys, crosses the path of another keyless citizen.

Another link is cattle. In the morning Stephen has to listen to a speech of Mr. Deasy (paternal like Bloom) who plays the part of Nestor to Stephen's Telemachos. Deasy gives him a letter on foot and mouth disease which he requests Stephen to try and have printed in two papers. Stephen thinks of himself as a 'bullockbefriending bard'. Now Bloom has had some sort of job in the cattle trade and in *Cyclops* he takes part in a conversation on foot and mouth disease. "So Joe starts telling the citizen about the foot and mouth disease and the cattle traders and taking action in the matter and the citizen sending them all to the rightabout and Bloom coming out with his sheepdip for the seat and a hoose drench for coughing calves and the guaranteed remedy for timber tongue."<sup>51</sup>

'Silence, exile and cunning' were to be Stephen's arms against the world. His exile took him to Paris where he met another Irish exile, Kevin Egan. Egan recognises him as a son of his father: "You're your father's son. I know the voice."<sup>52</sup> In the *Lotus-eaters* Bloom thinks of his own father: "The scene he was always talking about where the old blind Abraham recognizes the voice and puts his fingers on his face. — Nathan's voice! His son's voice! I hear the voice of Nathan who left his father to die of

---

<sup>46</sup> p. 155.

<sup>47</sup> p. 512.

<sup>48</sup> p. 389.

<sup>49</sup> p. 628.

<sup>50</sup> p. 698.

<sup>51</sup> p. 327.

<sup>52</sup> p. 47.



grief and misery in my arms, who left the house of his father and left the God of his father." 53

An even more curious 'spiritual' link between the two protagonists is the following. Stephen has explained his ideas about Shakespeare and in winding up he says: "He found in the world without as actual what was in his world within as possible. Maeterlinck says: *If Socrates leave his house today he will find the sage seated on his doorstep. If Judas go forth tonight it is to Judas his steps will tend.* Every life is many days, day after day. We walk through ourselves, meeting robbers, giants, old men, young men, wives, widows, brothers-in-love. But always meeting ourselves." 54 Now Bloom, who of course has not been present at the meeting in the library and who has not heard Stephen speak, says exactly the same thing later on in the day in *Nausicaa*: "Curious she an only child. I an only child. So it returns. Think you're escaping and run into yourself. Longest way round is the shortest way home." 55

There is another little link which deserves special mention because it is characteristic of Joyce's technique. Bloom goes to the butcher to buy something for his breakfast. While he is waiting for his turn to be served he picks up a piece of an old newspaper and reads about 'Agendath Netaim: planter's company'. 56 It is an offer to buy shares in a plantation in Palestine. The reader is requested to communicate with Bleibtreu-strasse 34, Berlin W. 15. In *Scylla and Charybdis* John Eglinton mentions to Stephen another solution of the *Hamlet* mystery, a theory put forward by: "Herr Bleibtreu, the man Piper met in Berlin". 57

We have already come across the remark concerning the wise child that knows her own father. It is a saying of Simon Dedalus which links him to his son who speaks of fatherly eyes that know not his own child. Bloom quotes Simon in the *Sirens*: "Wise child that knows her father. Dedalus said. Me?" 58 And in the *Oxen of the Sun* it says: "Now he (i.e. Bloom) is himself paternal and these about him might be his sons. Who can say? The wise father knows his own child." 59 Every is the way in which Stephen and Bloom meet in the spirit at the bookhawker's cart. We have already seen how M'Coy wondered what Bloom was buying at the bookcart. Nine pages further on in *Ulysses* we see Stephen passing the same cart. "He turned and halted by the slanted bookcart." 60 Looking through the secondhand books Stephen reflects: "Thumbed pages and pages: read and read. Who has passed here before me?" It is Bloom who has passed there before him. 'So dark is destiny'.

There are other links between the two, but there is one more or less occult link which must be mentioned here. Stephen had a dream the night before Bloomsday. He describes the dream as follows: "Open hallway. Street of harlots. Remember. Haroun al Raschid .... That man led me, spoke. I was not afraid. The melon he had he held against

---

53 p. 78.

54 p. 220.

55 p. 394.

56 p. 61.

57 p. 221.

58 p. 282.

59 p. 434.

60 p. 250.

me face. Smiled: creamfruit smell. That was the rule, said. In. Come. Red carpet spread. You will see who."<sup>61</sup> This dream comes true in the course of the night of Bloomsday. Stephen goes to the 'street of harlots' and the brothel of Bella Cohen. 'That man' is of course Bloom who is his *fidus Achates* both in *Circe* and in *Eumaeus*. The melon is associated with the 'melonfields of Agendath Netaim' in Bloom's mind and with his salutation of fleshly melons in the night. Bloom must further be indentified with Haroun al Raschid, not only because he is an oriental, but also because in *Circe* he appears as 'Incog Haroun al Raschid'.<sup>62</sup> In *Circe* Stephen remembers his dream: "Mark me. I dreamt of a watermelon.... (Extending his arms) It was here. Street of harlots.... Where is the red carpet spread?"<sup>63</sup> But Bloom also had a dream in the same night. "Dreamt last night? Wait. Something confused. She had red slippers on. Turkish, wore the breeches."<sup>64</sup> Note the red colour of the slippers. The 'she' is Mrs. Bloom. "He having dreamed tonight a strange fancy of his dame Mrs. Moll with red slippers on in pair of Turkey trunks which is thought by those in ken to be for a change."<sup>65</sup> Like Stephen Bloom also sees his dream come true in *Circe*. "A VOICE (*Sharply*): Poldy! BLOOM: Who? (*He ducks and wards off a blow clumsily*) At your service. (*He looks up. Beside her mirage of datepalms a handsome woman in Turkish costume stands before him. Opulent curves fill out her scarlet trousers...*)."<sup>66</sup>

There are more examples of this spiritual communion between Bloom and Stephen. But the above will suffice for the present purpose.

MEETINGS IN THE FLESH. *Ulysses* describes the peregrinations of two keyless citizens, Bloom and Stephen, through Dublin on Bloomsday. Already at the very beginning of *Ulysses* the reader is made to feel that a 'dark destiny' unites Stephen and Bloom, though neither of them knows it. Both part from their dwellings without their keys, leaving their homes to usurpers. Slowly and inexorably fate brings them together that they may know each other's frustration and may leave each other unconsolated. Before actually meeting Bloom sees Stephen twice in the course of the day. In *Hades* he sees him passing his carriage and he mentions the fact to Simon Dedalus who is with him. "Mr. Bloom at gaze saw a lithe young man, clad in mourning, a wide hat. — There's a friend of yours gone by, Dedalus, he said. — Who is that? — Your son and heir? — Where is he? Mr. Dedalus said, stretching over across."<sup>67</sup> Dedalus just misses seeing his son. "Mr. Dedalus fell back, saying: — Was that Mulligan cad with him? His *fidus Achates*? — No, Mr. Bloom said. He was alone." This is one of those passages which are easily passed over by a casual reader without his seeing its profound significance. Dedalus asks whether Stephen was accompanied by his *fidus Achates* and Bloom answers that Stephen was alone. Later on in the day he is to find Stephen alone

---

<sup>61</sup> p. 51.  
<sup>62</sup> p. 585.  
<sup>63</sup> p. 572-573.  
<sup>64</sup> p. 396.  
<sup>65</sup> p. 416.  
<sup>66</sup> p. 459.  
<sup>67</sup> p. 91.

and he, Bloom, will be his *fidus Achates* and is actually called that in *Eumaeus*. The second time Bloom nearly meets Stephen is in *Aeolus* when Bloom is after the advertisement. We have already come across that occurrence. Once more destiny will bring them together without an actual meeting taking place. Bloom nearly runs into Blazes Boylan, the usurper-to-be of his home and wife. He takes refuge in the museum where he looks for a former ad of the house of Keyes. In the same building Stephen is holding forth on Shakespeare at that very moment and the usurper of his home, Mulligan, is due to surprise him there in a few minutes. After the long discussion on *Hamlet* Stephen and Mulligan leave the library together: "A man passed out between them, bowing, greeting.... — The wandering jew, Buck Mulligan whispered with clown's awe. Did you see his eye? He looked upon you to lust after you. I fear thee, ancient mariner. O, Kinch, thou art in peril."<sup>68</sup> This lewd remark of Mulligan contains a prophecy. Telemachos is to meet Odysseus-Bloom, the wandering jew, the ancient mariner. It is not until the *Oxen of the Sun* that Bloom and Stephen actually meet. Bloom has gone to the maternity hospital where Mrs. Purefoy is about to be delivered of a child. He finds Stephen there with a company of friends. All drink beer. Bloom is very paternal and Deasy-like: "And sir Leopold sat with them for he bore fast friendship to sir Simon and to this his son young Stephen...."<sup>69</sup> He calms Stephen when he is frightened by a heavy thunderstroke. "And master Bloom at the braggard's side spoke to him calming words to slumber his great fear...."<sup>70</sup>

Here is the place to discuss a salient feature of the relationship between Bloom and Stephen. Many critics will have it that Bloom is to be considered as Stephen's spiritual father. This of course would upset the balance of 'frustration'. The only relationship between them is a mystical one as we have already seen. But this relationship does not alleviate and certainly not put an end to their frustration. They meet and sunder, a sonless father and a fatherless son, unconsoled. For how could the man in quest of bodily fatherhood be the father of a son in quest of spiritual sonship? Both Stephen and Bloom are conscious of this fact as will be shown. They accompany each other through four episodes: *The Oxen of the Sun*, *Circe*, *Eumaeus*, and *Ithaca*. In *Circe* Bloom has gone after his young friend whom he will find in the brothel of Bella Cohen: "What am I following him for? Still, he is the best of that lot. If I hadn't heard about Mrs. Beaufoy Purefoy I wouldn't have gone and wouldn't have met. Kismet."<sup>71</sup> Bloom begins to feel the burden of destiny. But he does not know what he is following Stephen for. Curious and significant in this respect is the question asked by Zoe: "You are not his father, are you?" To which Bloom answers: "Not I."<sup>72</sup> In *Circe* Stephen and Bloom are caught in a colourful and cosmic pandemonium. There is a row afterwards and Bloom helps Stephen out of a difficulty with the police. Then follows the *Eumaeus* episode in the cabman's shelter. Bloom is a bit officious but

<sup>68</sup> p. 225. cp. note 22. The 'clown's awe' refers of course to the 'clown in quest of paternity'.

<sup>69</sup> p. 407.

<sup>70</sup> p. 414.

<sup>71</sup> p. 471.

<sup>72</sup> p. 491.



means well. But the reader should entertain no doubt concerning the relationship between the two in this and the following episode. He is allowed to read Bloom's thoughts. And he will soon discover that Bloom is no more than an opportunist with an eye for the main chance: "he felt it was interest and duty even to wait on and profit by the unlooked for occasion, though why he could not exactly tell, being, as it was, already several shillings to the bad, having, in fact, let himself in for it. Still, to cultivate the acquaintance of someone of no uncommon calibre who could provide food for reflection would amply repay any small...."<sup>73</sup> Hardly a father who has found a son at last! A similar impression is conveyed by the following passage: "The vicinity of the young man he certainly relished, educated, distingué, and impulsive into the bargain, far and away the pick of the bunch, though you wouldn't think he had it in him ... yet you would."<sup>74</sup> And again: "Everything pointed to the fact that it behoved him to avail himself to the full of the opportunity, all things considered."<sup>75</sup> Like all the sons of his race, Bloom has an eye for the main chance, though he is not picking a purse but a brain. Joyce rather crudely informs the reader of this fact: "In fact, he (i.e. Stephen) had the ball at his feet and that was the very reason why the other, possessed of a remarkably sharp nose for smelling a rat of any sort, hung on to him at all."<sup>76</sup> All sorts of wild schemes occur to Bloom. He wants Stephen to teach Mrs. Bloom to pronounce her Italian correctly. He also wants him to take singing lessons in order to 'have the world at his feet' (with Bloom an obliging manager), etc. There is not much of a father-son feeling between them, though Bloom fancies there is some sort of 'analogy'.<sup>77</sup> On closer investigation it appears that this supposed analogy is no more than the fact that Bloom when young 'had a sneaking regard for the same ultra ideas'.<sup>78</sup> Bloom does not nearly realize the difference between his own slipshod easygoing lucubrations and the ruthless activity of Stephen's keen mind. Stephen himself is quite indifferent towards Bloom. He even insults Bloom in his own house by singing a very offensive song about ritual murder. Bloom listened to the song 'with mixed feelings',<sup>79</sup> as well he might. Judging Stephen by ordinary standards of social intercourse he rather meanly abused Bloom's hospitality (however officious). He even has a feeling of physical repulsion towards the man Bloom. In *Eumaeus* Bloom suggests that they go home together and Stephen accepts hesitatingly. Bloom passes his left arm in Stephen's right and Stephen "thought he felt a strange kind of flesh of a different man approach him, sinewless and wobbly and all that".<sup>80</sup>

In the course of their conversation in *Ithaca* they remember two former meetings, one when Stephen was five, and one when he was ten.<sup>81</sup> At the first meeting Stephen had been 'reluctant to give his hand in salutation', and at the second meeting he had asked Bloom to have dinner with them,

---

<sup>73</sup> p. 642.

<sup>74</sup> p. 650.

<sup>75</sup> p. 654.

<sup>76</sup> p. 662.

<sup>77</sup> p. 653.

<sup>78</sup> p. 653.

<sup>79</sup> p. 691.

<sup>80</sup> p. 658.

<sup>81</sup> p. 678-679.

a request in which Stephen was seconded by his father. Bloom refused. So dark is destiny. For in *Ithaca* Bloom invites Stephen to spend the night in his house. But "Was the proposal of asylum accepted? — Promptly, inexplicably, with amicability, gratefully it was declined."<sup>82</sup> Now it must be borne in mind that Stephen had nowhere to go to for the night and the hour was three in the morning. He would have to spend the night wandering through the deserted streets of Dublin, tired though he was. He could easily have accepted Bloom's offer. But this refusal is again a symbol of frustration. Stephen indulges in no sentimentality. He is a lone man and he accepts his loneliness. Lest sentimentality should be allowed to hide the merciless truth, Stephen and Bloom are shown by the author making water together and then Stephen leaves. There is one moment of supreme anguish on Bloom's part when Stephen is leaving: "Alone, what did Bloom hear? The double reverberation of retreating feet on the heavenborn earth, the double vibration of a jew's harp in the resonant lane. Alone, what did Bloom feel? The cold of interstellar space...."<sup>83</sup> Stephen has taken his loneliness, his pride, away from Bloom to whom loneliness is left as a sorrow.

Groningen.

D. G. VAN DER VAT.

---

## Notes and News

### The Red White and Blue

#### A Footnote to English Literary History

All students of British Imperialism have noted the curious Jingo phase on which that originally moderate and pedestrian movement entered in the '90s, and which culminated in the South African war. It was not an exclusively English phenomenon. It was a reaction against 19th Century Liberalism which made itself felt more or less in all European countries, and very strongly in the United States. In England it was expounded by one or two writers of standing, and by a section of the Press, but essentially it was an intrusion from below, the release of a hitherto unsuspected fund of vulgarity among a section of the population which now became vocal for the first time.

It was a short-lived movement, and it died a long time ago. After 1902 it left no trace on English colonial or foreign policy. But while it lasted it attracted a good deal of attention abroad. In some quarters it was admired and even imitated, in others it aroused an animosity towards England which died hard. For perhaps the most unfortunate thing about the Jingoism of the '90s was the persistency with which it denied the English tradition of decency, respect for opponents, and love of fair play. It amounted, in fact, to a campaign of misrepresentation of the English

---

<sup>82</sup> p. 696.

<sup>83</sup> p. 705.

character, perversely engineered by the English themselves. It also tended, by flooding everything in the same meretricious light, to make even the most impressive achievements of England in the field of colonial expansion look tawdry and cheap.

In those days the English middle classes came very near to persuading themselves that they were a sort of modern Vikings, schooled in the arts of war and endowed by the Creator with a special aptitude for conquest and government, and that War was a nursery of all the noblest virtues.

Everybody knows the part played by the one writer of genius who allied himself with the movement: Kipling, and anyone who cares can look up such contributions of its lesser lights as have found their way into books. But its real literature was a much less respectable one and has never found its way into literary textbooks. By now it has, indeed, vanished completely, apart from those stacks of song-books, reciters' manuals and penny ballads which repose in the store-rooms of the British Museum. Here, among the copies of "Daisy", "Two Little Girls in Blue", "The Masher and the Barmaid", and "We All Went Home in a Cab", is the material for the real literary history of this phase of English Jingoism.

Its literary value is nil. Most of the hundreds of patriotic ballads of the '90s are incredibly empty concoctions of phrases about the Old Flag of England, the Red, White and Blue, and the Soldiers of the Queen. But as historical documents they are by no means to be despised. Taken as a whole, these productions really give a picture of what happens when a democracy catches the war fever. It is not a particularly pleasant picture, but after all the whole thing is over and done with, and one can afford to laugh a little at it now.

Throughout the Victorian age the makers of English popular ballads were extremely fond of writing about soldiers and war. But in the early and mid-Victorian epochs this predilection generally took a form so sentimental and so far removed from actual life as to appear completely innocent even to the most pacific of modern readers. There are songs about dying soldiers' visions of their mothers, heroic bugler boys, and girls left behind, in the style of that favourite of Mr. Silas Wegg and his contemporaries, about the soldier who leaned upon his sword and wiped away a tear.

In the '90s the tone changes. The hero of the ballad is no longer just a soldier, he is an English soldier and the old sentimental appeal gives place to something much less simple: the writer tends to identify himself and his audience with his heroes, and the recital of the latter's merits becomes more and more obviously a pretext for self-congratulation or undisguised bragging: "Our boys in red, they have never fled / From the face of the strongest foe, — Our troops on land shall the world command / Our Jack Tars rule the wave."

A contributor to the "Tit-Bits Monster Book of Patriotic Verse" throws open wider historical perspectives in a poem called "John Bull's Flag":

In Kent when Romans tried to seize old John Bull's native soil  
We didn't let great ~~Cæsar~~ get the best of all the spoil.  
We thrashed the Danes and Saxons too, and history can brag  
That Britons did their best to hold John Bull's untarnished flag.

The stanza is followed by one in which the writer, possibly owing to the difficulty of finding enough words to rhyme with "flag", assures his audience that "Britons seldom brag".



But the popular favourite of the '90s was the song entitled "The Soldiers of the Queen":

The soldiers of the Queen, my boys,  
Who've been, my boys, who've seen, my boys,  
In the fight for England's glory, boys,  
When we've had to show them what we mean.  
And when we say we've always won,  
And when they ask us how it's done  
We'll proudly point to every one  
Of England's soldiers of the Queen.

The above specimens are fairly representative of the patriotic music-hall ditty of the '90s. Sometimes more concrete matters attract the attention of the writers. Foreign affairs are glanced at:

The Russians and Dutch  
The French and more such  
Wish to upset our wise constitution.<sup>1</sup>

#### Or the Colonial Question:

While Britain's sons their freedom boast,  
Their Queen, their laws, their nation,  
The colonies now form a host  
For mutual preservation.

But generally the poet does not come down to particulars, but confines himself to celebrating "the home of the old Sea-Kings" (a favourite expression) and its sons, or to give expression to such sentiments as:

All men may be heroes in England, we know,  
From the general down to the ranks,  
And our soldiers will conquer wherever they go  
And thus gain from the nation true thanks.

or:

Off with your hat as the flag goes by  
And let the heart have its say.  
You're man enough for a tear in your eye  
That you will not wipe away.

And lest the audience, which must, after all, have been predominantly civilian, should think that this appreciation of their military fellow-citizens was being a little overdone, the poet was careful to point out that:

there's a soldier's heart in every Englishman.

Then comes the anti-Transvaal campaign in the press, and the outbreak of the South African War. The providers of popular ballads are not slow to rise to the occasion. All the familiar phenomena of bellicose mob enthusiasm at once make their appearance. The cause espoused by the country to which oneself happens to belong is that of Justice and Humanity: "We fear no foe against us", announces the author of a song called "England's honour", "while Justice reigns supreme; Our Patience and our

---

<sup>1</sup> Quoted from Tit-Bits 1899. It sounds older.

Policy proclaim the rights we mean" (sic) — while another bard, called Goldenberg, declares that

The Boers will never win for sinful is their cause,  
They stepped beyond the bounds of human laws.

It need hardly be said that the war is a purely defensive one :

The foeman's foot is on England's soil  
Our homes to pillage, our lands to spoil,

declares one poet, adding in a subsequent stanza that England is fighting "for altar, for church, for throne." It is curious to see how these poets anticipate the sentiments of 1914. One of them asserts e.g. that this is a war "to save humanity" and that it will result in "freedom won for all mankind". That the Almighty himself was fighting on the side of the British, little as the results might appear to show it, is a statement which frequently occurs.<sup>2</sup> Alfred Austin, the Poet Laureate, even advances the opinion that "who dies for England dies for God."<sup>3</sup>

Several writers seem to be under the impression that for foreigners to wage war on the British Empire constitutes an act of rebellion, punishable as such, and the Transvaalers are often alluded to as "rebels". One of the writers who shared this opinion was Alfred Austin, who in his "Songs of England" urged the soldiers :

To force the foe from covert crag  
And chase them till they fall;  
Then plant forever England's flag  
Upon the rebel wall.

But few of our poets rise to such philosophic heights. Even the author of "England's Honour", who thought the war was to save Humanity, announces himself as being also in favour of the simpler war aim of "avenging Majuba Hill". And most of the poems written at the outbreak of the war simply confine themselves to anticipatory triumphs over the enemy.

We'll bump old Kruger straight  
Bump the Boer with all our weight,  
Bump him fair and bump him square  
Bump and make him grin and stare.  
We'll bump and make him quake,  
Bump him black and bump him blue.  
British pluck and steel shall make  
The wretched rebel rue.

The author of "Britain's Goal" reminds his readers that

Buller's there to lead, lads  
To the British goal.

and goes on to say :

<sup>2</sup> The Daily Mail's leader on the relief of Ladysmith began: "The Almighty God, whose arm is strength, has blessed the efforts of General Buller's Army in Natal with complete victory." (quoted: Review of Reviews, 1900, p. 208.)

<sup>3</sup> Songs of England.

The Boer will ne'er forget us,  
 This time he's gone too far,  
 He's roused the British lion,  
 He's caused and forced a war.

Scores of other writers describe how "we" will "show them steel" and "make the beggars run."

A good many of these anticipations are marked by a kind of vicarious sadism. If there is one thing the street poet never tires of describing it is the delights of bayonet fighting :

When a chance comes near, lads,  
 Show the Boer some steel ;  
 Make him flee before you  
 Make him cringe and kneel ;  
 Crush him on the fields, lads,  
 Fight with British will.  
 Win, my lads, at all costs,  
 Avenge Majuba Hill.

And one Mr. Rutherford wrote a touching poem (for recital) about a bugler boy, who "in shooting Boers quite proudly took his share."

The Boer War was fought at a time when the methods of mass suggestion had not been brought to the perfection reached in 1914. On the whole, the English record as regards decency and fairness to the enemy was not a bad one and certainly much better than that of any of the belligerents in the Great War. Many English war correspondents were ready from the start to acknowledge the chivalry and bravery of the enemy, and towards the close of the war Boer leaders like De Wet enjoyed something approaching to popularity in England. Combatants like Colonel Seeley protested against attempts to slander the enemy. General White, the commandant of Ladysmith, publicly praised the conduct of the Boer leaders, and Lord Roberts sent a message of condolence to Kruger on the death of Joubert, the victor of Colenso.

But in the subterranean literature with which we are dealing here there is no trace whatever of any such decent feeling. Perhaps the most unpleasant thing about it is the gusto with which the writers throw themselves into the work of abusing the enemy. That the Boers were cowards had been taken for granted from the start. Their successes must therefore be due to cunning or treachery. Did they not habitually abuse the white flag, fire at ambulances, and murder the wounded? The same Mr. Rutherford who celebrated the bugler boy speaks of his opponents as "vain and canting" and "trickster Boers." Another poet writes :

Onward Tommy Atkins,  
 Onward in the War,  
 'Gainst the Boers so vicious  
 Treach'rous to the core.

The Poet Laureate, Alfred Austin, belonged, of course, to a different class of writers to the ones we are dealing with here, in so far as his works appeared in *The Times* and ultimately got printed in volumes at 6 sh. instead of in penny sheets, but otherwise there was not much to choose between them. His "Songs of England" describe the Boers as "a race, though of a northern strain, with narrow foreheads and narrower



hearts" who "fettered and flogged the sons of Ham, and tethered the stranger's wrist."

Any stick was good enough to beat the "rebels". If the enemy had been France, who can doubt that the standing indictment would have been their "Godlessness"? As it was, the religiousness of the Boers was actually one of the stock accusations against them, and they are constantly referred to as "canting" and "praying".

When in the spring of 1900 it looked as if the Boers were beaten, none of these writers evinced any trace of respect for a brave enemy. The flight of the old President was hailed with derisive comments. A funeral ard was hawked in the streets for a penny, bearing the inscription:

In remembrance of Oom Paul, Late President of the Republic, who succumbed to an attack of the Roineks on Pretoria Day June 5., 1900.

The disasters of 1899 had made no difference whatever to the anticipatory triumphs of our poets. Indeed the most curious thing about this literature is its complete divorce from reality. These songsters live in an imaginary world, where everything is true if you repeat it emphatically enough, and in which nothing has any reference to the facts of the real one. One feels that if the French had invaded England the music-hall audiences would have applauded songs asserting that the Soldiers of the Queen always won, on the day when the enemy marched into London. Even after Black Week the ballad writers went on producing songs about the invincibility of the British army. The British defeat at Spion Kop was e.g. celebrated by a street ballad beginning:

Kind Sir, have you seen, cried an intelligent girl  
To a wounded man just come from the Transvaal War ...

which asserts that:

The Boers ran away from the face  
Of their most gallant bayonet charge.

Nor does the surrender of thousands of British soldiers deter the poets from asserting that "Our soldiers know no word retreat."

One anonymous writer announces, with only too much truth, that

The British have a knack  
Of frontal bold attack.

While another gives the following version of Buller's tactics before Ladysmith:

The signal's given, through storms of lead  
Our gallant soldiers forward sped —  
With ringing shouts they dashed below  
With headlong fury on the foe,  
They reach the guns o'er heaps of dead  
While foes who could before them fled  
.....  
The field is won....

The idealization of the private soldier to which the audience is treated bears witness to the same divorce from reality. This is how Tommy Atkins describes himself in a "Reply to Mr. Kipling's Fine Poem":

I'm a funny sort of beggar,  
 And on war I'm very keen  
 I'll fight for home and honour,  
 And be loyal to my Queen.

.....  
 But when I hear the dogs of war  
 I'm like a lion at bay, etc.

In another song a dying soldier says (referring to the Queen's Xmas gift of boxes of sweets):

Give this — it is my last request —  
 Royal chocolate box to mother.

A good deal of the talent which the war called forth was of a somewhat eccentric character. One gentleman, who signs himself Stephen Downes and prints his photograph above his poem, reminds the President that:

I told you at the beginning of the war  
 Your great responsibility, and what it all was for.

But as Mr. Kruger has failed to take his advice he very naturally concludes:

From me you have no pity, I cannot sympathize  
 With such a scamp as you, Sir, full of deceit and lies.  
 And now just let me tell you, Sir, that in another world  
 You'll suffer for the innocents you've massacred so bold.

One lady in Barbadoes declares with pardonable ignorance of the finer shades of English poetic diction:

Our New Year's song sent up to God  
 Was VICTORY!! DEATH!! and BLOODY SOD!

In the spring of 1900 the writers of street ballads and music-hall songs tend to concentrate more and more on the siege of Mafeking, whose defenders in the words of one of them are "wounded every day". When at last it is relieved numerous ballads celebrate the glad news. "London is dancing with halcyon glee" is the *mot juste* with which one of them describes Mafeking Night.

After that the ballads become fewer. It may have been that the first martial enthusiasm had worn off, or that the later phases of the war did not lend themselves so well to poetic treatment. Or perhaps the reaction was already setting in which was to make an end of this sort of thing, dare one hope for ever?

Copenhagen.

C. A. BODELSEN.

**English Studies at Amsterdam.** Dr. P. N. U. Harting, hitherto Professor of English Philology in the University of Groningen, has been appointed at the University of Amsterdam to succeed Prof. Dr. W. van der Gaaf, who is retiring on account of the age limit.

---

**England To-day and To-morrow.** According to *The Times Literary Supplement*, June 12, 1937, an English translation of Kurt von Stutterheim's *England Heute und Morgen*, a review of which by the London correspondent of the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant* appeared in our June number, will be published by Sidgwick & Jackson during the summer.

---

**Corrigendum.** We regret that in the February number the name of the writer of the article on 'Case in English' was erroneously spelled Bazele instead of Bazell.

A further contribution by the same author will appear in the October number.

---

## Reviews

*The Influence of Low Dutch on the English Vocabulary.* By E. C. LLEWELLYN. (Publications of the Philological Society, XII.) xii + 223 pp. Oxford University Press. London: Milford. 1936. 10s. 6d.

Mr. Llewellyn has collected a large number of words borrowed from Low Dutch — i.e. all the continental Low German dialects: Flemish, Dutch, Frisian, and Low German (p. iv) — and classified them according to various spheres of activity. As this had not been done before, his book serves a useful purpose: one can now see at a glance what has been the influence of those languages on the English vocabulary in the matter of trade, fishing, agriculture, brewing, etc. I agree with Mr. Llewellyn in his opinion about and treatment of most of the individual words, for reasons which will appear below; but even so I consider the book as a whole highly unsatisfactory, not so much on account of what it contains, as because of what it omits. Both in the Introduction and in the text one looks in vain for an acknowledgement of the debt he owes to what apparently have been his chief sources. A few examples will make this clear.

In the Introduction (p. vi) the writer states that it has been his chief aim 'to indicate the possible channels of entry of Low Dutch words into English'. But this was done by me in the *historical introduction* to my *Dictionary of the Low-Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary*, on account of its length published in a separate volume *Anglo-Dutch Relations*, 1925, which Mr. Llewellyn has included with the *Dictionary* itself in his



*Bibliography.* As, in addition to twenty books of history which I have not used, he includes ten of those which are in my *List of Books Referred To* (three by W. Cunningham, the *Dictionary of National Biography*, Evelyn's *Diary*, J. R. Green, P. A. Meilink, J. Ruinen, Stow's *Survey*, A. Thierry), he must have found my *A.-Du. Rel.* a very great help — especially because it contains a very copious Index — in finding the passages in *A.-Du. Rel.* and in these ten books that bear on the subject, for I have always most scrupulously added a footnote mentioning book and page to every passage derived by me from those books, so that it would be easy for any one who desired to do so, to check my references. They were certainly not meant for the use that Mr. Llewellyn has been pleased to make of them. He has made it very difficult for a reviewer to check his references, for he has put them at the foot of the page at which the section over which the passages referred to are distributed begins. For instance, if one should wish to check what has been derived from Meilink for Ch. 3, section 6, p. 38, which section is about half a page in length, one would have to wade through about 80 pages of Meilink's book, for the notes refer to 'M. 25-90, 227-34, 242-51'. It must also have been very convenient to the writer that I translated the passages derived from Meilink and Ruinen into English, so that he had only to alter the wording a little, without troubling about verifying the correctness of my translation of the Dutch original.

Why, when the writer quotes passages from the *Paston Letters* (p. 143 ll. 10-17), does he not include this book in his *Bibliography*? Why does he not include Froissart, from whose *Chronique* — I suppose it is from the *Chronicle*, for the writer only mentions Froissart as his source (p. 18) — he quotes probably what he has found in my *A.-Du. Rel.*, as he does in the case of the quotation from the *Paston Letters*? He is very inconsistent in this respect, for when he copies a quotation from *OED.*, he sometimes considers it necessary to put the title of the book from which *OED.* quotes, in his *Bibliography*, which he has no right to do, if he does not make use of the book himself.

In my list of *Books Referred To* I have included A. Thierry, *Histoire de la Conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands*. Paris, 1867. Mr. Llewellyn includes in his *Bibliography* 'A. Thierry, *The History of the Conquest of England*. 1867'. Was this translation of Thierry's work published in the same year as its original, and where, and translated by whom? It is very curious that at the foot of p. 1 of the text there are references to Th. I. 328-9, 349, II. 154, which also occur in my *A.-Du. Rel.*, p. 9 note 8, p. 10 note 5 and p. 19 note 8; for, if the writer has not simply copied, in slightly different wording, what I have derived from the original French work, it would be evident that the original and its translation were not only published in the same year, but have the same pagination with the same contents in every page. I may add that in the references at the foot of p. 1 in the book under review my *A.-Du. Rel.* is not mentioned. In the footnotes to Ch. 2, section 1, I do not find *A.-Du. Rel.*, nor Thierry, nor Freeman, but in p. 16 I find almost *verbatim* copies of passages occurring in *A.-Du. Rel.*, derived, as appears from the footnotes 3, 4, 6 and 7 in p. 9 of my book, from Thierry I. 315, Freedom 101, 116, Thierry I. 322 and Freeman 96. Freeman E.A., *A Short History of the Norman Conquest of England*. Oxford, 1887, is in my list of *Books Referred To*, but not in Mr. Llewellyn's *Bibliography*.

That he writes twice about a Duke (*sic*) of Holland (pp. 2 and 19); that the Dutch admiral Tromp (called van Tromp by the writer, which he would certainly not have done if he had used the original, as he ought to have done, of Blok's *Geschiedenis van het Nederlandsche Volk* instead of a translation) was killed in a fight off ter Herde (*r. ter Heide*) (p. 67); that the third Dutch War was declared in 1670 instead of 1672 (p. 68); that he calls Mechlin the Flemish name for Malines (p. 48); that he calls Campvere Campoere (p. 90); that he writes south Holland (p. 90) and north Holland (p. 150 s.v. *Waterlander* and p. 202 s.v. *Sledge*) instead of the Province of South- or North-Holland, if he does not know that the Dutch names are *Zuid-Holland* and *Noord-Holland* for the two provinces north of Zealand, might be called slips or printer's errors in the work of a well-informed man, but I do not hesitate to call them the result of ignorance in this book.

Reviewing the other part of the book, which deals with the Low-Dutch loanwords that the writer has tried to classify — had he but stuck to this only! — I will begin, as I have done in connexion with the historical introductions, with his *Bibliography* and the use he has made of the twenty-eight books (Grammars and Dictionaries) mentioned in it. Of two of them, viz. *OED.* and my *Dictionary*, he has made a very extensive use, quoting from their columns all the M.Du., M.L.G., Du. and L.G. words that occur in his book, sometimes mentioning their sources, but oftener without mentioning any source at all. In the former case the writer has included the title of the book of reference in his *Bibliography*. How can it be that we have found the names Björkman, van Ginneken, Jordan, Kruisinga, Schönfeld, Toll and eleven others in his *Bibliography* without a single reference to their books in Mr. Llewellyn's text? The *Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek* (*Mnl. Wdb.*) and the *Nederlandsch Woordenboek* (de Vries en te Winkel) (*Ndl. Wdb.*), which I have quoted hundreds of times, mentioning them every time, are in Mr. Ll.'s *Bibliography*, and yet *Mnl. Wdb.* is mentioned only twice, in quotations from my *Dict.* (p. 105 s.v. *Brake* and p. 119 s.v. *Clack*); similarly *Ndl. Wdb.* s.v. *Buck-bean* (p. 145) and s.v. *Boodle* (p. 179). In the last case my name is mentioned, but so that no one would for a moment think that the quotation from *Ndl. Wdb.* had been copied from my article. In the other three articles my name does not occur at all. More about this below.

I will now refer to some things said by Mr. Llewellyn in his *Introduction*. In p. iii he begins by stating: 'The words treated in this book have been collected from the pages of the *Oxford English Dictionary* and the Supplement to that work'. This is not true, for there are some, to be referred to below, that he has taken *verbatim*, or almost so, from my *Dict.* The next sentence: 'I have not used the *English Dialect Dictionary*, as words in dialectal use do not fall within the scope of my work', is untrue, because he has included some from the *OED.* Like me, he has included obsolete Low-Dutch loan-words and those 'which were never really naturalized'. These two kinds of words are marked † and || respectively in *OED.*, and after *OED.* also by me, but Mr. Llewellyn has not marked them at all, which is wrong. He further informs us that he has included a class of 'words of Portuguese and Spanish or of native Malay and South

African origin borrowed into Dutch, thence passing into English in their Dutch form'. Then why has he left out *Gas*, which was formed by van Helmont on the Greek for chaos? He says (s.v. *Blas* p. 148): 'because it did ~~not~~ have a Low Dutch basis'. I do not know on whose authority he ~~makes~~ this statement, but have those Portuguese, Spanish, native Malay and South African words a Low Dutch basis?

The next paragraph in p. iii begins as follows: 'I have taken the explanations of the meanings of the words as given by the *Oxford English Dictionary*'. Not quite true, for he very often changes some words, or gives only part of the explanation in *OED*, so that 'based on those given by the *OED*.' would have been better.

Further we read: 'The form of the word is *always* (the italics are mine) the Main Form, as used by the *OED*. to head its article'. Now *Biseten* (p. 155) does not occur as the main form in *OED*., where it is to be found as a form of sense 3†d s.v. *Beset*. I discovered the origin of this form and wrote a separate article on this MFlem. loan-word, unrecognized as such by *OED*. Mr. Llewellyn copies the whole of my article without having the good grace to mention my *Dict*. as the source. The words *East* and *Buschie* do not occur as main forms in *OED*., but *East* does in mine and in the book under review, while *Buschie* does not occur as a main form in *OED*. or in my *Dict*., but what Mr. Llewellyn says about its form and what must have made him insert it (p. 199), he must have taken from my article on *Bushman*, for it is not in *OED*., where it is only given as a by-form of *Bushman*.

I cannot help commenting briefly on the following three statements made by the writer in p. iv. ll. 9-18: 'I had hoped that a considerable number of words, especially from the earlier volumes, given in the *OED*., as of unknown or obscure origin, could have been proved to be of Low Dutch origin. I have found but few words capable of such proof, and at times I have been almost discouraged at being forced so often to agree with the etymologies of the *OED*. Most of my etymologies, then, are practically identical with those proposed by the *OED*., but even when I have had nothing to add, I have always verified and investigated for myself'.

By 'my etymologies' the writer can only mean *the etymologies given in my book*, while the rest of the sentence would have been more correct, if after *OED*. he had added 'and Bense'. There is nothing in the book to prove the truth of his statement 'I have always verified and investigated for myself'.

Let us now turn to page vi, line 18 from the bottom, where we read: 'There has been no space for the exhaustive treatment of each individual word to be found in Bense's *Dictionary* etc. Many words treated by Bense I have not been able to include. For some the evidence is not sufficiently convincing to warrant it'.

With what the writer says in the first sentence I can quite agree, for then he would have had to copy from my *Dict*. much more than he has already done. When he borrows my conclusions, he can only base them on the very evidence adduced by me, which is for me the advantage of the exhaustive treatment, which Mr. Llewellyn naturally eschews for the reason stated. The second sentence is both unscholarly and unfair, for he should have explained why not. The last sentence is still more unfair in its vagueness, for by not mentioning any of the cases he cannot agree



with, and by not giving a shred of evidence, he arrogates to himself an opinion of my work which he does not substantiate.

I will now add some evidence of the writer's plagiarism.

Counting words that have the same form as nouns, verbs and adjectives as separate words, I find that in Mr. Llewellyn's *Index Verborum* there are altogether 1491 words. Counting from the word *Smeke* there are 330 words in the book which are not in my *Dictionary*, simply because this is not complete yet, so that Mr. Llewellyn's only source for the Main Forms of these words must have been *OED*. I have checked the articles on 106 of these 330, taking them quite at random, viz. the first in each page that contains one or more, and when I came to *Smeke* (p. 221) I took this word and every tenth after it, comparing them all with the corresponding articles in *OED*. and its Supplement. Thus I have found that on the whole Mr. Llewellyn's are more or less faithful copies of those in *OED*., with the changes above referred to. It struck me that whenever *OED*. refers to a German (OHG., MHG., HG.) cognate, Mr. Llewellyn omits it, whereas he always copies the Swedish and Danish cognates. Can this be because the writer has some difficulty in distinguishing German from Dutch? This would appear from his article on *Geck* 'a gesture of derision etc.' (p. 192), where he has: 'apparently ad. Du. or L.G. *geck*, vbl. sb., corresponding to *gecken*, as in Du. *in geck sagen*, to say in jest (in Kilian, *in geck segghen*)'. *OED*. is not mentioned, and thus escapes blame for Mr. Llewellyn's assertions. *OED*. has '= Du. and G.', which the writer changes to 'apparently ad. Du. or L.G. *geck*', without stating on what evidence, while he calls *OED*.'s German phrase *in geck sagen* Dutch for 'to say in jest', although the quotation from Kilian, also copied from *OED*., might have made him pause before he gave the German phrase as Dutch.

One or two instances from those 330 words must do to show what curious mistakes the writer makes even in copying. *OED*. s.v. *Walcheren* has: 'The name of a Dutch island at the mouth of the Schelde. Used in comb. as *Walcheren ague*, *fever*'. The result of Mr. Llewellyn's *verification and investigation for himself* leads him to write this (p. 7): '*Walcheren* (1810), the *Walcheren fever* (*sic*); from the name of a Dutch island in Zealand'; as if there were any islands other than Dutch in Zealand.

Mr. Llewellyn s.v. *Cockatiel* (p. 182) says: 'O.E.D. suggests that this is an adaptation from the Pg. diminutive of *cacatú*, perhaps *cacatilho* or *cacatelho*'. *OED*. s.v. suggests nothing of the kind, but in a *note* gives this as the opinion of Dr. J. W. Muller of Leiden, who says: '*kaketielje* is no regularly formed Du. dim. of *kaketoe*, but looks like an adaptation of a Pg. dim. (?*cacatilho*, *cacatelho*) of *cacatú*, cockatoo'.

I do not intend to write any more about the articles in the book under review which are not yet in my *Dictionary*: they are all more or less like those in *OED*., chiefly differing in this respect that the writer usually substitutes *perhaps ad.*, *possibly ad.*, or *probably ad.* for *OED*.'s =, or *Cf.*, or *Corresponds to* before some cognate Du. or G. word. It does not appear on what grounds he introduces such changes.

As I do not wish to accuse the writer of plagiarism without adducing proper evidence, I have compared the twenty-one articles in which the writer mentions my name, and four hundred and thirty-eight in which he does not do so, with the corresponding articles in the *OED*. and in my

*Dictionary*, in addition to the one hundred and six above-mentioned that I could only compare with the articles in *OED*.

First something about the twenty-one in which there would be no question of camouflaged plagiarism, if the writer had only used quotation marks to indicate what he owes to the authors or books mentioned; instead of doing this, however, he often mixes them up with unsupported assertions of his own, so that only those who, as I have done, compare the articles in the three books, can find out which is which.

Besides the 21 articles in which my name occurs, I have found 249 in which the writer has plagiarized my *Dictionary*, either by copying the article almost *verbatim*, or by copying my conclusions without a scrap of evidence to show that they are not his own. He appears to have placed such implicit reliance on my work, that he even copies my errors. So in the article on *Book-binding* (p. 177), which he has taken from my *Dictionary*, for the *OED*, does not give it as a loan-word at all, I find that the date of its earliest occurrence is 1787, which I inadvertently wrote for 1854, as given in *OED*. My name is not mentioned at all, though the writer also copies what I have written about the Dutch origin of the second element of this compound, which *OED*. does not treat as a loan-word either.

In his article on *Boor's Mustard* (p. 146) he copies the printer's error *Baurenseufe* for *Baurenseufe* which occurs in the article on this word in my *Dict.*, but not in *OED*. This is one of the 21 cases in which he acknowledges his source.

Another error of mine he copies is the form *dubbeltie* for *dubblentie* s.v. *Doublejee* (p. 211), correctly given in *OED*.

To show how Mr. Llewellyn camouflages his plagiarism, I will here deal with some of the articles in which I have found plagiarism from my work.

1. *Beguel* (p. 106). Mr. Llewellyn has: 'O.E.D. says that this word is ad. Du. *beugel*, iron hoop or ring, bow, cramp iron; this is quite possible, but Bense has failed to find it as a Du. or Flem. term "in connexion with hops", in which sense it is used in the only quotation in O.E.D., from Miller's *Gard. Dict.*; the only senses in which it appears to be used in connexion with agriculture in Du. and Flem. are "part of a plough" and "a hoop used in making hayricks"'. Compare this with my article, which runs: 'N.E.D. considers this *obs. sb.* adopted from the Du. *beugel* "iron hoop or ring, bow, cramp iron"'. Now this is quite possible, only we have failed to find it as a Du. or Flem. term used "in connexion with hops", in which sense it is used in the only quot. N.E.D. gives, from Miller's *Gard. Dict.* s.v. *Lupulus*. The only sense in which it appears to be used in connexion with agriculture in Du. or Flem. is that of a part of a plough (Ndl. Wdb. s.v. *Beugel* 16), and in connexion with hayricks (*Ibid.* 17). See also de Bo and Id. A.D.'

Who would be able to tell that the words 'this is quite possible' were used by me first, and that all the rest of the article in the book under review is also from my *Dictionary*, with the omission of the necessary references to be found in my article?

2. *Crap* (p. 106). This article is too long to be copied here. My name is not mentioned in it, though O.E.D. occurs twice, but as there are no quotation marks, no one who does not compare this article with the one in the O.E.D., will discover that the words 'M.Du. *crappe*' (three lines after *OED*. has been mentioned as the source of what follows) down to 'cinders' three lines lower down, have been taken from my *Dictionary*, while the rest of the article, partly in his own words, partly almost literally in mine, can only have been suggested to the writer by my article. *OED*. calls the word identical with earlier Du., comparing Kilian, and compares Fr. *crape*, quoting M. L. Delisle in Godefroy, which is given by the writer as if it were *OED*'s own definition.

3. *Domineer* (p. 191). Mr. Llewellyn here changes *OED*'s 'app. a. early mod. Du. to 'ad. e. mod. Du.', which change he can only have made under the influence of my article on this verb, for the only things he writes after stating that it is 'ad. e. mod. Du.,

ad. F.' are the following: a) 'the word was perhaps introduced by the mercenary soldiers', b) 'who might have given it its harsh sense when speaking of the arbitrary and severe rule of the Dutch city functionaries' and c) 'or it may have been brought in by the religious refugees who fled from the Spanish tyranny in the Netherlands'.

The difference between what the writer here says and what he has found in my article is the order of the ideas a and c, and the words in which they are expressed; the statement sub b is perhaps his own. The most important fact on which I base my conclusions he has omitted altogether.

4. *Sea-fardinger* (p. 212). After stating that the word means 'seafarer', the writer says: 'perhaps an alteration of Du. *zeevaarder*, seafarer, after Eng. *passenger* or *seafaring*'. This is all. The writer forgets to acknowledge his indebtedness for the article down to the word *passenger* to *OED.*, and for the alternative *seafaring* to Bense, who explains in half a column why he rejects *OED.*'s *passenger* for the alternative *seafaring*.

5. *Bush* (p. 133). After the definition Mr. Llewellyn has: 'Skeat says it is ad. Du. *bus*, in the same sense, O.E.D. ad. M.Du. *busse*, though the word does not appear to have this particular sense in M.Du.; the form is not easy to account for, and O.E.D. refers to a similar change in the final consonant in the early forms of *blunderbuss* and *harquebus*. The vb. is from the sb., *Bush* (1566), to furnish with a bush; O.E.D. says that it appears to have been erroneously associated with F. *bouche*, mouth, *boucher*, to stop up, or *bouchon*, cork, plug, whence the frequent later form *bouche*; the association with these F. words may in part account for the final consonant of the sb.'

In these two articles Bense is not mentioned, though from 'Skeat says' down to 'same sense' is from my *Dict.*, as are also the lines from 'though the word' down to 'account for', and in the article on the verb from 'the association' to the end.

6. *Buss* (p. 94). From the opening line down to 'OF. *busse*' in the third line is from *OED.*; from here down to 'Dunkirk' has been taken from Bense, without mentioning either of them. He changes Bense's 'imported from the coast near Dunkirk', which I derived from Fr.-v. W., not mentioned by Mr. Llewellyn — see the next word — to the nonsensical 'imported on the coast near Dunkirk'.

7. *Crag* (p. 189). In this article the writer quotes from my *Dict.*, without mentioning it: 'Fr.-v.W. says that late ON. *kragi* is from MLG.' Unfortunately for the plagiarist he tried to mention my source, and as Fr.-v.W. is not in his *Bibliography*, he could not very well make use of this abbreviation. Now, if he had looked up my *List of Abbreviations and Signs* in Part I, p. XIII, col. 1, he would have found that these letters stand for 'Dr. N. van Wijk. *Franck's Etymologisch Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal*', i.e. *Franck's Dict.*, 2nd. ed., edited by Dr. N. van Wijk; and what does the writer make of this abbreviation? FR. VAN WELY (the capitals are mine). Did he perhaps use Prick van Wely's English-Dutch and Dutch-English Dict., when he was trying to make out the meaning of Dutch texts, when he could not avoid such efforts by using translations?

8. *After-deal* (p. 153). Mr. Llewellyn's sad lack of knowledge of the subject he pretends to deal with appears in more than this, though it could hardly be worse. In writing this article he evidently forgot to consult the *OED.* for the meaning of the word, and as he could not find it in my article, he had to rely on his own resources with this poor result: 'After-deal, the hind parts, posteriors; probably ad. M.Du. *achterdel* (Du. and Flem. *achterdeel*), in the same sense; but it is possible that this was an English word of native formation'. *OED.* has: 'Afterdeal Obs. [AFTER- 4 fig. or 5 + DEAL, part, opposed to foredeal. Cf. Germ. *Vorthheil* and *Nachtheil* with same meaning.] A disadvantage'. Nothing else besides a few quotations, the first from Caxton *Reynard*, which induced me to investigate if the word could possibly be from M.Du. or Flem. I therefore consulted Mnl. Wdb. and found what I quote in my article, mentioning the source. My article on *After-deal* — this form with a hyphen Mr. Llewellyn has taken from me, for *OED.* spells *Afterdeal*, so another error on my part copied by Mr. Llewellyn — runs: 'The sense in which Caxton uses this word in his translation of *Reynard* (1481, quot. in N.E.D.) corresponds exactly to the original meaning of M.Du. *achterdeel*, which was very common (Mnl. Wdb.). It might have been a native English word, and this may account for the fact that, unlike most words borrowed by Caxton from Du. or Flem., it was used by a few other writers after him. In Holland *achterdeel* was still very common in the 17th c. (Ndl. Wdb.); and in WFlem. it is in everyday use (de Bo)'.

Mr. Llewellyn did not find the meaning of M.E. *afterdeal* in my article, but if he had made the regular use of the *OED.* that he says he has made with regard to the definitions, he would have known that the sense was 'disadvantage'. He must have consulted Prick van Wely's Dutch-English Dict. for the sense of Du. *achterdeel*, forgetting that Caxton could not very well have borrowed from mod. Du., and have found 'hind-



part, posterior', which he corrected as shown above, or he has consulted, though I have my doubts about it, Ndl. Wdb. s.v. *Achterdeel*, sense 1, which is that of the mod. Du. word, which is not recorded of the M.Du. *achterdeel*, and is explained by Ndl. Wdb. by giving the French equivalents 'le derrière, le postérieur' and the Lat. 'posterioria', while he must have neglected to read what Ndl. Wdb. says about the Du. word in sense 2, which is that in which Caxton uses *afterdeal*.

Mr. Llewellyn sometimes forgets that he uses the term 'Low Dutch', as I do, in a collective sense, for in the article on *Bundle* (p. 187) he refers to Du. forms only and calls them Low Dutch.

In p. 152 the writer says: 'Caxton from his thirty-years' residence in the Netherlands must have been perfectly bilingual. It is obvious that he thought as easily in Flemish as in English, and when he needed a word, the Flemish sprang to his mind instead of its English equivalent'. Now the first example given by the writer is from *OED.*: '*Winbrow* ad. MLG. *winbrâ*.' Now both LG. and Flem. belong to the Low Dutch group, but is MLG. the same as Flem.?

After this I do not think any one will expect me to discuss any more of the 270 words referred to above. They show a painstaking use of my Dictionary, which would be flattering if it had been acknowledged. As it is, I do not feel honoured by these attentions, and I can only hope that other users will show a better sense of propriety.

Arnhem.

J. F. BENSE.

*The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names.* By EILERT EKWALL. Large 8<sup>o</sup>, xlviii + 520 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1936. 15 s. net.

The present Dictionary deals with the place-names of England only, those of Wales, Man, Scotland and Ireland being excluded. Without attempting to compete with the exhaustive survey published by the English Place-Name Society, it is as complete as can be expected from a portable dictionary: the names for the country itself (Albion, Britain, England), of its chief divisions, counties, towns, villages, parishes, the names of rivers, streams, rivulets, and of quite a number of hamlets, estates and even streets are taken into account in such a comprehensive way as to satisfy the most exacting readers. The chief aim is of course the etymological explanation of the names. This requires a thorough knowledge of English and of its history, great familiarity with Old and Middle English no less than with Old Norse and Celtic; a fair acquaintance with the topography of most places and no small experience of dialect English, both in the past and in the present. Readers of *English Studies* need no reminder that the author is in every respect equipped for his task and they will not be surprised to learn that he has carried it out as perfectly as could be expected. But the extraordinary service rendered once more to English philology by Prof. Ekwall deserves full acknowledgement.

Much has been said about the study of place-names and its interest. I can, however, recommend everybody, even specialists, to read the Introduction (pp. vii-xxxiv), which deals with: I. General Remarks. II. Various types of Place-names (Folk-names; Habitation-names proper; Original Nature-names). III. The Various Origins of English Place-names

(Celtic; English; Scandinavian; Latin; French; other sources). IV. The Value of Place-name Study. V. Arrangement of the Dictionary. The Paragraph concerning the Habitation-names deserves special notice. It must be emphasized that we know very little about the conditions of life of the ancient Germans, either in their former homes or in their new settlements in Gaul or Britain. According to the author, *hām* and *tūn* denoted the homestead originally and came very early to mean a group of homesteads, a village. On the other hand, *thorp* or *throp* is certainly not a village: cp. M.Du. *dorp*, the original meaning of which seems to be "akker, hoeve, landgoed" (see the examples in Verdam). Bolton, Hampton, Hampstead denoted independent settlements (p. xv). Owing to our almost complete ignorance of O.Du., it is much more difficult to give adequate definitions of the equivalents of *hām*, *tūn* (the latter very rare on the continent), *thorp*, *wic*, *stede*, etc. But the more precise data furnished by the English nomenclature are a valuable help, at least for comparisons. On the other hand, Du. *bies* (see Beeston) or *zwin* (see \**swin*, creek, channel), etc., have suggested etymologies which would not have been obvious without them.

A very large number of place-names are explained by personal names, some well known to all specialists in Anglo-Saxon, a still larger number not recorded in independent use. As far as pet-names are concerned, it is quite normal to find numerous instances of them in everyday nomenclature, such as names of farms and meadows. In later times many a Dick or Jack would have insisted on being called Richard or John if he could have suspected that his descendants' official surname would be Dixon or Jackson instead of Richardson or Johnson. In the same way *Curra*, *Cossa*, *Edla*, *Heald* and many others are probably non-official denominations; their possessors never guessed that they were marked out for the honour of being recorded in a Dictionary. The element *cock* (cuc-, cog-) is referred partly to O.E. *cocc*, *cock* (also 'woodcock'), partly to a personal name *Cuca*, partly to O.E. *cocc* meaning 'hill', 'heap' or something of the kind. The latter sense does not seem to occur in independent use and I should rather suppose an ō-variant of *cake* (M.Du. *coeke*, Du. *koek*, Ger. *Kuchen*) as in Koekelare (W. Fland., Belgium), a° 847 *Cokenlare*.

It is of course impossible to discuss even a small proportion of the numerous etymologies proposed in this work. Many of the articles of the Dictionary are excellent in every respect. See, e.g., Birdlip, Botley, *hlāw*, *stoc* and *stocc*, *stōw*, *þorp*, Chilton, etc., etc. The headings, it may be noted, are not only place-names but also common nouns either in modern English or in Anglo-Saxon form which is sometimes troublesome because one has to look in more than one place to find the word one wants. This is really, however, one of the great helps that the Dictionary affords to all scholars. Foreigners will not be able to guess immediately which names contain O.E. *hēah* or *healh* and they will be thankful for the lists of derivatives found under each toponymical lemma. O.E. *hamor* is explained as 'rock, cliff', a meaning not evidenced by examples in O.E., whereas Norse *hamarr* is well known to mean rock. It might perhaps be remarked that numerous *Marteau's* in the Belgian-French nomenclature denote the site of a former smithy. This applies not only to Hammersmith — with which the author compares Ger. *Hammerschmiede*, etc. — but perhaps to other Hammer- names.

Comparisons with Du. place-names are of course numerous. Beeston

(Du. *bies*, reed) has already been noticed. Billers, bilders, 'water-cress' (of Celtic origin according to the author) is interesting in view of *Binder-veld* (Belg. Limb.), formerly *Bilrevelt* (a<sup>o</sup> 1135); *Bilstain* near Verviers is identical in formation with *Bilston*; *Lopham* = *Lophem* (near Bruges); *Corkickle* is *Keekle*, a river-name, preceded by *Cor-*, an obscure element: cf. *Kor-beek*, *Corbais* (-bais, French from *beek*), which is generally explained by reference to M.Du. *korren*, 'to make a squeaking sound'. *Eupen*, 1213 *Oipen* (on a hill), seems to contain a derivative from *op*, to be compared with O.E. *yppe* (hill, eminence) from *upp*. The wild cat is supposed to account for many a name in *Cat-* or *Cad-*. Such names are found elsewhere and the riddle is not merely English, for it is difficult to believe that wild cats played such a role as to outnumber all other tame or wild animals in place-names (cf. J. Lindemans, *Bull. Commission Topon. & Dialectologie*, VI, 71 seq., where another explanation is proposed, without however, as far as I can see, solving the problem). *Threshfield*, 'place where corn was threshed', Du. *Deerlijk* (W. Fland.) from *Tresleca* a<sup>o</sup> 1111 (i.e., \**thresleca*), are examples of the root of thresh, which is very seldom found in place-names. I happen to differ from the author about *Waver* (see *Waverley*), where he assumes the meaning of 'woodland' to be the original one, on the basis of continental names like *Wabra silva* (now *la Woèvre*), *Waverlo* in Holland, etc. (N.G.N., III, 347). It is always extremely dangerous to conclude to the meaning of a toponym from the present-day aspect of a place. All the known *Wavers* may be woods, but it does not therefore follow that *waver* is a word for wood.

The great originality of Prof. Ekwall's Dictionary is that it is the first complete dictionary of place-names of its kind in existence. Similar works in France or in Germany cannot compete with it either for completeness or scientific value. It can only be hoped that all the authors of comprehensive toponymical lexica will take this work as a model.

Liège.

J. MANSION.

*Der etymologische Ursprung der neuenglischen Lautgruppe [sk].* Von V. ROYCE WEST, Ph. D. (Anglistische Forschungen, Heft 83.) xxviii + 308 pp. + 16 maps. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 1936. 16 RM.

Dr. West's treatise really deals with two different problems. Chapter I, the longest in the book (116 pp.), is devoted to a study of the development of OE *sk* (*sc*). Chapters II-XI give a full survey, arranged chronologically, of loanwords containing the sound-group [sk], Scandinavian, Dutch, French, Latin and so on. To these are added Ch. XII, where words of doubtful origin are collected and discussed, and Ch. XIII, which sums up the results of the preceding chapters. There is a valuable Index, which fills pp. 274-308.

The most interesting and important part is the first (Ch. I). Here we first get a detailed survey of the history of research as regards OE *sc*, the various opinions that have been put forward from Rask on being marshalled in due order. It is now generally held that initial *sc* became



[f] regularly, there being some doubt as to the combination *scr*, for which it has been suggested that *sc* to some extent may have been preserved as [sk]. Dr. West accepts the main theory and holds that *scr*- remained as [skr] in some dialects, viz. those of Scotland, the North, the North Midland and the South West. Some words with *skr*- were adopted by Standard English and spread also to other dialects, as *scrape*, *scream*, which are regular in all dialects. Maps 1-14 show the distribution of the forms in [skr] and [fr] in modern dialects and partly in Middle English. As regards medial and final *sc*, Dr. West on the whole follows Weyhe (E. St. 39) and takes the normal development to have been *sc* > [f], except medially before and finally after a back vowel, where [sk] remained. Deviations from these rules are due to analogical change or to foreign, chiefly Scandinavian, influence.

The main results will be generally accepted, except possibly the theory regarding *scr*-. The evidence in its favour is not absolutely conclusive. Forms such as *scrape*, *screed* may be due to Scandinavian influence, just as well as *skeigh* (OE *scēoh*, p. 56) or place-names such as *Skelton*, *Skipton*, *Skirlaugh*, *Skyrack*. Forms with *skr*- may have spread to Standard English and other dialects from such dialects where Scandinavian influence was strong. It may also be worth considering whether *sk* may not to some extent be due to Norman influence. A place-name such as *Skirmett* in Bucks (OE *scirgemōt*) would be better explained as a Norman, than as a Scandinavian form. On the other hand there are certainly facts which tell in favour of Dr. West's theory. The place-name *Scrainwood* in Northumberland (for the etymology see my Place-name Dictionary) would go well with it. Incidentally I think Dr. West is sometimes apt to rely a little too implicitly on early spellings. Early ME forms with *scr*- should be used with great caution. I am not convinced that *scrud* in Trin. Hom. proves [skr]. On the other hand Shakespeare's *schreame* surely does not represent a form with [fr].

The chapters dealing with *sk* in loanwords hardly offer the same interest as the first. Some, as those dealing with Scandinavian or Dutch words, are of importance because of the etymological problems they present. Incidentally I remark that Dr. West is somewhat liable to overestimate Dutch influence. There is no reason, so far as I can see, to derive dial. *dreksl* 'threshold' or *buxom* from Dutch. A change *pr*- > *dr*- is common in dialects. It may also be questioned whether some of the words taken to be Dutch may not just as well be Low German.

I must confess I do not quite see the value of the long lists of learned loanwords, with full apparatus, such as pronunciation, and etymological information mainly derived from the NED, which happen to contain [sk]. I am referring to words such as *lacuscular*, *interscapilium*, *schindylexis*, also to such as *exclaim*, *excrement*, *disclose*, *discomfort*, *discourage* etc. At any rate it would have been a definite advantage if the information had been given in a considerably condensed form, especially where it is based on NED.

Ch. XII brings up for discussion many interesting problems, but most are too difficult for a definite solution to be possible.

A few notes may be added on some points of detail.

Place-name forms are frequently adduced, but might have been made fuller use of. Names such as *Fiskerton*, *Skipton* might have been discussed.

In connection with *scl* for *sl* the place-name *Scaitcliffe* (Lancs.) might have been mentioned. It contains ME *sclate* from OFr *esclate*. The *c* is not here intrusive, but the name *Scaitcliffe* shows that ME *sclate* was pronounced with [skl].

On p. 58 the curious East Anglian *xall* (*xuld*) is discussed. I may mention a suggestion of mine made long ago, but never published. The form *xall* may have developed in the combination *ic scal* with loss of *i-* as in *chill* for *ichill* (*ich will*). Either *ixall* really comes from *ic sal*, if we may assume that *sal* was used in early East Anglian, or else it is due to substitution of [ks] for [kf].

The derivation of Engl *scold* (p. 121) was given by me already in my *Shakspeare's Vocabulary* (1903).

In Ch. III the division into Anglo-Norman and Central French words is not very fortunate, because most of the words in the latter category are doubtless Anglo-Norman, though there is no phonetic criterion to prove it. It would have been better to have taken early French loanwords to be Anglo-Norman, except such as are proved by phonetic criteria to be Central French. For the matter of that, it is quite possible that many words of the latter type were in reality introduced by way of Anglo-Norman.

Dr. West's book is a valuable and welcome contribution to English philology, even though in most cases very important new results were not to be attained. It is a very careful piece of work, which testifies to wide reading and sound philological training.

Lund.

EILERT EK WALL.

*Die Gradadverbien im Mittelenlischen.* Von ADOLF FETTIG.  
(Anglistische Forschungen, Heft 79.) 222 pp. Heidelberg:  
Carl Winter: 1935. RM. 11.60.

This volume is evidently intended to be a counterpart dealing with Middle English to Borst's *Die Gradadverbien im Englischen* (no. 10 of the same series), to which it bears a strong resemblance in arrangement and similar details. It consists of two sections, the first of which contains statistics of the occurrence of adverbs of degree in different Middle English texts and dialects, illustrating changes in their use and their relative frequency in different sources. The disappearance of *swipe* in Middle English, and the rise of *very*, *right*, and other modern intensives are clearly shown. Restrictive adverbs are dealt with in a similar manner, though these are less frequent and important. The arrangement is instructive, and the tables containing particulars of use and frequency are useful. The totals and percentages given make the impression of being correct, though errors are bound to occur, I daresay, among such a mass of figures. The periods of a hundred years according to which the tables are arranged, seem sometimes to be too long; it might have been useful occasionally to have a more detailed account of the first and last years of the currency of a certain word. The statistics share the weakness of their kind in perhaps not always giving an undistorted picture of what they are intended

to illustrate, as when the frequency of a particular intensive during a certain period is due to one author's preference for it (e.g. *inōh*, p. 16, 18), which is, however, duly noted by the author.

The second section of the book deals with separate intensives and restrictives in articles copiously illustrated by quotations from a great number of texts. No attempt is made in this section to arrange them in groups according to sense, or to trace their sense development through actual excerpts from literature. The word *very*, the semantic development of which is unusually fully dealt with, is an exception. The arrangement is according to grammatical categories, and there are long lists of often nearly identical quotations, occasionally several pages, which, unfortunately, does not make the volume easy reading or further ease of reference, while testifying to its author's thoroughness and industry. Occasional inconsistencies seem to occur in the distribution of the quotations. Adjectives like *crooked* or *lettered* are quoted under the heading 'participles'; original participles like *adrad*, *dismayed*, *abashed* are also classed among the verbs, but in the majority of cases quoted they have a purely adjectival function. The distinction may not be wholly without importance for the correct interpretation of the preceding adverb. *Unknown* is once treated as adjective and participle on the same page; and *forleten* (p. 67) is the infinitive, not a participle. Here and there the author does not distinguish very clearly between adverbs when having a purely intensive force and when retaining some modal sense. There is a considerable difference in sense between *full* in expressions like *ful oft*, *ful wel* where it means simply 'very', and in *ful bulde*, *full enformed*, *ful clothed*, *full cured*, etc. (p. 102), i.e. with verbs, where the sense of *full* is 'completely', 'thoroughly', 'ready' (built, dressed), and it is no mere intensive; the quotations under this heading are certainly rather mixed. The difference in sense is recognised by the author, but he does not seem to draw the full inference from it. The same criticism applies to the quotations under *strong* (*the pot boyles strongly* = 'violently', 'in a violent manner'), also to *dedly*, etc. There are numerous minor inaccuracies and misprints in the quotations and references: p. 69: *read up brac* for *umpræc* (!); p. 71: *r. coniure* f. *conuire*; p. 86: *r. barers* f. *barres*; p. 97: *r. curtasly* f. *curstasly*; p. 122 *r. espaunted* f. *ex-*; p. 170: *r. icwemet* f. *icwet* (!); p. 187 *r. crowing* f. *crowning*; etc. etc.

Lund.

OLOF ANDERSON.

*Directions for Speech and Style.* By JOHN HOSKINS. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by HOYT H. HUDSON. (Princeton Studies in English, 12.) xl + 112 pp. Princeton University Press. London: Milford. 1935. \$2.50.

Among the numerous testimonies to the immense popularity of Sidney's *Arcadia* in the late sixteenth and the greater part of the seventeenth century, so hard for most modern readers to understand, few are more striking than a ms. treatise preserved at the British Museum (Harleian MS. 4604), entitled *Directions for Speech and Style* etc., and written about the year



1600 by John Hoskins, a lawyer and member of the Middle Temple. The *Directions*, specially drawn up for the benefit of a young gentleman of the Temple, the son of a friend of the author's, enumerate, classify and illustrate all or most of the figures of rhetoric, a thorough grounding in which was then held to be essential for the acquisition of a literary style. As the title-page informs us, the quotations used by way of illustration are taken from Sidney's *Arcadia*, 'the first edition in quarto without Samford's Additions,' i.e., the edition of 1590, containing only the two completed books of the revised version, with a lengthy fragment of a third. Moreover, as we learn from the *Directions*, Hoskins presented the young man with a copy of the *Arcadia*, with metaphors and other stylistic features specially noted in the margins. A more effective method of instruction it would be hard to conceive; and that Sidney's romance should have been chosen as apparently the most suitable exemplar is particularly significant.

Attention was first drawn to Hoskins' treatise by Prof. W. M. Wallace in his *Life of Sir Philip Sidney* (Cambridge, 1915). Following up his clue I read the manuscript and gave a brief account of its contents in my study of the *Arcadia* in 1929, a more detailed summary being included by Miss Mona Wilson in her book on Sidney in 1932.<sup>1</sup> Prof. Hoyt Hudson has now done excellent work by bringing out a printed edition of the whole essay, prefaced by an introduction — on the author and his writings; the purpose and contents of the *Directions*; their sources; (unacknowledged) borrowings from them by Ben Jonson, Blount and Smith; manuscripts and text — and followed by copious notes. He has modernized the spelling and punctuation, a proceeding which in this case, at least, has much to commend it, especially as the manuscript evidently does not represent the author's own hand. As far as I have collated it, Prof. Hudson's text is unexceptionable; it is only with considerable diffidence that I venture to suggest the interpolation of a comma after the word *teaching* on page 8 (Harleian MS. 850, which, as Prof. Hudson points out, contains an early copy of about one third of the treatise, actually has one). Cancells, errors, doubtful readings and similar features of the ms. are duly registered in the notes; it would, perhaps, be pedantic to complain that the editor has not aimed at exhaustiveness in this respect. The first two letters of *impossibility* (see notes to p. 29) in MS 4606 appear to me to have been deliberately cancelled rather than blotted by a bad pen, and Blount's reading 'possibility' somehow seems preferable.

From the editor's observations on the first folio edition of the *Arcadia* the literature of the subject would appear to be limited to Aubrey's *Lives* and Miss Yates' *John Florio*. In his notes on emblems one looks in vain for a reference to Brie or Praz.

The Hague.

R. W. ZANDVOORT.

---

<sup>1</sup> For some obscure reason these notices are ignored by the present editor, who, apart from Wallace, only refers to a letter by Miss L. B. Osborn in the *Times Literary Supplement*, May 1, 1930.

*A Flame in Sunlight, The Life and Work of Thomas De Quincey.* By EDWARD SACKVILLE WEST. xiii—352 pp., with 4 plates in photogravure. London: Cassell. 1936. 15s. net.

*Thomas De Quincey, A Biography.* By HORACE AINSWORTH EATON. xiii—542 pp., with 8 plates. New York: Oxford University Press. 1936. 24s. net.

One might have expected that the pioneer of the *paradis artificiels* would have inspired in the post-war period, so keen on psycho-analysis and *biographie romancée*, more comprehensive studies than Prof. C. T. Clapton's limited (though in itself exhaustive) essay on *Baudelaire et De Quincey* (Paris, 1931). But until recently the only full-length biography of De Quincey remained the Victorian one by Alexander H. Japp ("H. A. Page"). Then, all of a sudden, we have two thorough studies of the opium-eater. Are we to infer a revival of interest in an author whose elaborate style had ceased to appeal to the moderns in their craving for simplicity and directness? Or is it a pure coincidence, since the present writers treat their subject from different angles, Mr. Sackville West from that of a critic (and an artist) who has recently alighted on a congenial theme, Prof. Eaton from that of a scholar who has devoted years of research to a little explored corner? From this contrast one may easily understand why Mr. Sackville West's is the better biography: his is indeed a portrait and an interpretation, while Prof. Eaton's painstaking details, while calculated to leave no period in De Quincey's life uncharted, fail to convey a striking picture of the whole personage, or, at least, such a striking picture as that of Mr. Sackville West's. Perhaps Prof. Eaton's book suffers only by comparison; even as a scholar, on a particular point, he comes off with less distinction than one would have imagined. I mean the interpretation of heading 9 in a list of the "Constituents of Human Happiness" which De Quincey made in 1805: "A vast predominance of contempt, varied only with so much of action as the feelings may prompt by way of relief and invigoration to the faculty of contempt." Prof. Eaton embarks upon a laborious commentary: "Presumably this 'contempt' is hardly more than indifference to the criticisms of his fellows, self-sufficiency in the presence of dispraise, the sense of inward power unshaken of the world. I think we may see here again the reflection of Wordsworth, etc." Mr. Sackville West solves the riddle by reading "contemplation", and explaining in a footnote: "Not 'contempt', as erroneously printed in Japp."

But where the reader is likely to derive more amusement is in the comparison of the psychological interpretations of the two critics. Not that they are frequently at variance: there are facts and persons that do not admit of two opinions, such as the character of Mrs. De Quincey, which had a disastrous negative influence on the careers of her sons. But a case like the critic's reaction to the first of Thomas' extant letters, to his sister, is illuminating enough. For Prof. Eaton "the letter is revealing and reassuring. Thomas was thirteen and a half; Mary was eleven and something. This accounts for his writing down to her. But he does it all with charming and affectionate humour. He must have been a delightful elder brother." Mr. Sackville West is not so easy to captivate:

Bearing in mind the fact that the writer was a boy of fourteen, one is astonished at the precocious phraseology, at the Gothic elaboration of the sentences. Subject-matter apart, one would take the whole for the letter of an old man, of which it has still further characteristics — the chirpy facetiousness, the unnecessary italics, both of them strongly marked features of De Quincey's later style. Then, what ordinary boy of fourteen would refer to a contemporary as "Lord Altamont's only child"? This is the typical language of what nurses call an "old-fashioned" boy. The story of the robber gang shows that Thomas had already acquired that poring interest in crime — in 'Assize cases' — which was to remain an absorbing passion with him and to produce some of his most successful essays in the macabre. Its fascination consoled him, in some deep substratum of his being, for the vital action in which, after one brief and disastrous experiment, his life was singularly lacking. Remains the quaint signature — "Tabitha". It would be absurd to goggle learnedly over this little quip, which obviously had its origin in some private joke. At the same time, it is worth noticing, as evidence that Thomas himself was conscious of the feminine aspect of his character, even if only of the more superficial signs of it.

Here is a good sample of the characteristics of the two critics as psychologists. Prof. Eaton is ready to take things at their face value. Mr. Sackville West goes deeper, though he is never over-subtle. Without being a psycho-analyst, rather disbelieving in psycho-analysis, he is not content with blunt statements of the kind which are so frequent in Prof. Eaton. No psycho-analyst would accept Mr. Sackville West's explanation of De Quincey's attraction to the macabre; but, on the other hand, not one would fail to consider extremely naïve Prof. Eaton's view of that phenomenon:

The fact is that De Quincey was singularly gentle in his nature, passionately devoted to children, sympathetic with animals, considerate of women; a man for whom violence and suffering were fundamentally abhorrent. He was also keenly alive to the preciousness of human life and personality, as many protests in his work against physical chastisement in schools bear witness. All told, the very fact of murder had by the law of contraries a fascination for him.

The key to De Quincey's attraction to the macabre is obviously to be found in another characteristic which Mr. Sackville West has duly noticed (p. 17):

... There are signs, in Thomas' case, that his subjection to William, irksome as it may have been to him in some ways, yet brought him a queer, voluptuous delight. We have his own word for it that he "had a perfect craze for being despised", feeling contempt as "a sort of luxury that I was in continual fear of losing". The reason he gives for this preference is that by bowing to the contempt of a stronger person he thereby got rid of the responsibility he so much dreaded; but the evident ecstasy he experienced in yielding to this desire was more deeply involved with the appetite for feeling pain, an appetite which informed his whole adult life and shows itself strikingly in the nature of his subsequent dream-fantasies.

Mr. Sackville West has gone so far as to make of algolagnia the dominant factor in De Quincey's life, to the point of wondering whether his getting involved in a hopeless game of hide-and-seek with his creditors was actually due to an appetite for persecution,<sup>1</sup> and also, whether the embittering persuasion, in later years, that he was nothing but a journalist, supplied a kind of humiliated satisfaction. Indeed, Prof. Eaton's mild surmise: "Murders had for him a life-long interest and might suggest something

<sup>1</sup> This view finds support also in a passage of a letter of Mrs. Bairdsmith, De Quincey's daughter, to Mr. Findlay: "It was an accepted fact among us that he was able when saturated with opium to persuade himself and delighted to persuade himself (the excitement of terror was a real delight to him) that he was dogged by dark and mysterious foes." Prof. Eaton has qualified this statement by dedicating a considerable portion of his book to a detailed account of De Quincey's debts, which were of such nature as to cause real anxiety.



unhealthy in his make-up" — seems worthy of Dr. Watson. Mr. Sackville West may shrink from using that unpleasing and possibly inaccurate word, masochist, but the tendencies he describes are those for which that word stands. There is a famous passage in the *Confessions* of which Baudelaire's lines in the *Héautontimorouménos* read like an abstract:

Je suis la plaie et le couteau !  
Je suis le soufflet et la joue !  
Je suis les membres et la roue.  
Et la victime et le bourreau !

I was stared at, hooted at, grinned at, chattered at, by monkeys, by paroquets, by cockatoos. I ran into pagodas, and was fixed for centuries at the summit, or in secret rooms; I was the idol; I was the priest; I was worshipped; I was sacrificed, etc.

No less typical is the surrender of De Quincey to the rhythm of music or to the spirit of a crowd during his opium debauches: the need of divesting himself of his own personality in the abstraction of music<sup>2</sup>, in the anonymity of crowds. Mr. Sackville West remarks, as a consequence of De Quincey's enjoyment of music, that the method of construction of his imaginative prose is frequently nearer to that of music than is that of any other writer of the day — or indeed of any other writer at all (p. 134). There is another writer whose style has frequently suggested a comparison with music: Swinburne. And the fact is perhaps not without relevance that those morbid tendencies which found in De Quincey only indirect expression, were such a prominent feature of Swinburne.<sup>3</sup> However it may be, we owe to a musician the emphasizing of the sadistic element in the *Confessions*, for, we are told, Musset's version of them inspired Berlioz with the idea for the *Symphonie fantastique*, with its *Marche au supplice* and the Black Mass of the *Songue d'une nuit de sabbat*.

What precedes seems to countenance the current continental reputation of De Quincey as a forerunner of the decadents. The *Confessions* and *Murder Considered as One of the Fine Arts* are, however, only a small section of De Quincey's work, and, on the other hand, the story of his life, if it leaves the impression (in Prof. Eaton's words) of "one of the saddest careers in literary history", with its everlasting struggle to reduce doses of opium and figures of debts, bears little resemblance to the lives of the *poètes maudits*. But I think Mr. Sackville West overstates his case when he writes:

And here a word on the current continental reputation of De Quincey is in season. French and German writers, whose knowledge of De Quincey is mostly confined to the *Confessions*, unite in including him under the rubric of such figures as Huysmans and Beardsley, and treat his work as if it were a kind of pendant to *Les Fleurs du Mal*. The i's of this preposterous point of view have lately been sharply dotted in England itself by the otiose illustrations to an *édition de luxe* of the *Confessions*,

<sup>2</sup> See Schopenhauer, *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*, I Bd., 3 Buch, § 52.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. G. Lafourcade, *L'algolagnie de Swinburne*, in *Hippocrate, revue d'humanisme médical*, 1935, pp. 230-258, 326-349. Lafourcade's frankness may be contrasted with the fear of indiscretion in De Quincey's biographers. It is curious that Mr. Sackville West considers an expression of De Quincey's *Diary* written in 1803: "go to the same fat whore's ..." — as falling "like a bomb into the narrative," when this narrative is interspersed with phrases in Greek letters (pp. 143, 155, 161, 163, 172, 185, 190, 192) which denote a morbid interest in sex (is it the transcription into Greek which authorizes the remark by the same critic: "Where sexual matters were concerned he was the most prudish of men"?). More curious still, Prof. Eaton, who has edited that *Diary* in 1927, ignores all its references to sexual life.

which represent De Quincey in exactly this light. Nothing could be more at variance with the facts. To regard him as a decadent, *fin-de-siècle* figure is fundamentally to misconceive the nature of his being.

True, the opium dreams and the murder obsession are by no means the only notes of De Quincey the writer. But let us read the excellent description Mr. Sackville West gives of the process by which De Quincey became the author of the works that made him famous (p. 203):

Tortured by his body, he tried to defeat it by ignoring it, and by attempting to live shut up in the airless structure of the sole intellect. The result was of course a stalemate, — a gradual but obdurate slowing-down of his intellect under the protest of his body, until, in 1818, it ceased to function in accordance with his will, but went off at a tangent into a fantastic limbo of its own, the furniture of which lay about in a freedom of association that could not be put to the uses of living, though it might — and did — provide the material for poetry. Here, then — in the convulsions artificially induced by opium, which forced to the surface the raw stuff of a nature fundamentally poetic but at the same time consciously leaning away from the development of that one among his faculties — lies the explanation of the 'set' of his work towards the forms and effects of art which, instituted by the striking uprush of the *Confessions*, remained to inform all the rest of his work, more or less apparently, and which peeps through the joints of even his most drily expository periods ... It was the incidence of physical ill-health and its concomitant, laudanum, acting with increasing force over a long period of years, which inserted between eye and object (whether incident of childhood, contemporary or historical figure, or process of logic) the spectacles of artistic vision, saturating that object with peculiar and persuasive colour.

Having thus assigned to the opium dreams a paramount influence on the artistic development of De Quincey, let us see what aspects of De Quincey's nature they forced to the surface according to Mr. Sackville West (p. 172):

It forms no part of my present intention to attempt a Freudian assault on De Quincey's opium dreams. Their general provenance will, however, be fairly obvious to anyone with a little knowledge of psychology: the prevalence throughout of anxiety, the suspicion of persecution, the feeling of dread, of irrevocability, above all of guilt.

More explicitly, in a passage quoted above, the critic had written: "the appetite for feeling pain, an appetite which informed his whole adult life and shows itself strikingly in the nature of his subsequent dream-fantasies". The writer who was made an artist by dreams which revealed this aspect of his soul, may not have been a decadent, but surely the decadents of the *fin de siècle* were entitled to consider him as one of their Holy Fathers.

Unless we prefer, with Prof. Eaton, to think that the drug, far from making of De Quincey a greater writer, diverted him from his real calling (p. 312):

De Quincey should have been the man to interpret it [the tremendous philosophical movement in the north of Europe]; to do what Coleridge and Carlyle in their vague ways were attempting. He now and again declared that he was intending to do just that. But he never did; else his position in the history of English thought in the nineteenth century would be much more important than it is.

For Prof. Eaton De Quincey is chiefly a man who missed a great opportunity.

Rome.

MARIO PRAZ.

*An English Pronouncing Dictionary.* By DANIEL JONES.  
Fourth Edition, Revised and Enlarged. xxviii + 495 pp. London:  
Dent and Sons. 1937. Price 7s. 6d.

Twenty years after the publication of this standard work, which has been reprinted nearly every year, and slightly altered and supplemented already twice, a need of detailed revision has made itself felt. And so the present fourth edition is completely revised and considerably enlarged. It contains 5000 words more than the first edition, including the 600 additions which in the second and third edition were given in a supplement. The total number of entries now amounts to over 54000, of which about 13000 are proper names. Then there are alterations with some words and additional information is given with others. An appendix contains a list of the new words and of the entries that have been altered or supplemented since the first edition.

It is interesting to go through the list of additions, for it contains not only words that were accidentally omitted in the original edition, but also new words that have cropped up, and rare words that have become common in the last twenty years. Thus it mirrors the cultural and political developments of our own time more faithfully even than an appendix to an ordinary dictionary, because of the proper names that are included.

There is above all the large contribution made by technology. The list of words beginning with *aero-*, for example, has been extended. The pronunciation is now commonly *ɛərə-*, *eɪərə-* being only given in brackets. There are the proper names *ˈlɪnbə:g* and *bə:d*. — Then compounds of *moutə-*. We note *ˈmoutəka:*, *ˈmoutəfɪp* with single stress<sup>1</sup>, *ˈmoutəˈbaɪsɪkl* and *ˈmoutəˈbʌs* with level stress. We also find the different makes of cars: *ˈbjʊ(:)ɪk*, *ˈkraɪzlə*, *ˈsɪtrouən*, *ˈroulzˈrɔɪs*. Mark: *ˈpækə:d*, whose second syllable is not reduced to *ə* by English speakers. — Then film, wireless and the like; for example *ˈmu:vɪtoun*, *ˈlɪŋgwəfoun*. We note *ˈdʒæzˈbænd*, *ˈlaʊdˈspi:kə* with level stress.

Art and Science have made other additions necessary. We find *froid* and *ˈku:ei*, together with a great many new words beginning with *saikou-* (*psaikou-* has become less common). Then there are *pru:st*, *ˈpru:stɪən*; *ˈfɔ:sait*, *ˈdʒɒljən*, *bəˈsɪni*; *ˈændrɒkli:z*, *sn(t)ˈdʒoun*; *ˈgɪlgud*, *ˈepstain*. Names like Garbo, although familiar to every child at the moment, are not included.

Then Politics. The new coinings of the War, like *ˈnoumænzlænd*, seem hardly worth mentioning, so quickly does history get written to-day. But the following are useful additions: *ˈju:gouˈsla:vɪə*, *ˈtʃekouˈslouˈvælɪə*; *ˈmusəˈli:ni(:)* *ˈfæfɪzm*, *ˈhɪtlə*, *ˈhɪtlərəɪt*, *ˈna:tsɪ:*; *ˈlenɪn* (why not Stalin?), *ˈbɒlfəvɪk*, *ˈbɒlfi*, *ˈɔɡpu:*; *ˈgændi:*; *dəvəˈliərə*, *ˈdaɪlˈɛərən*; *ˈætətə:k*, *ˈkeɪməlˈpə:fə*, *ˈɪstæmˈbu:l*.

A few miscellaneous additions speak for themselves: *ˈwɪpsneɪd*; *ˈwʊlwə:p*<sup>2</sup>, *ˈbouzˈlaɪən*; *bəˈli:fə*; *ˈkɪtʃɪˈnet*, *ˈleɪdɪˈhelp*; *haɪk*; *pə:m*. Then *ˈsʌməˈtaɪm* in contradistinction from *ˈsʌmətaɪm*. There is *ˈzjuərɪk*,<sup>3</sup> whose university has conferred upon the author an honorary degree, and *ˈædɪsˈa:bəbə*. Finally we note *ˈæŋglɪsɪst*.

Another kind of addition, for which we are especially grateful, is a

<sup>1</sup> The *Dictionary* now uses vertical stress-marks.

<sup>2</sup> The *Dictionary* uses the symbol *θ*.

<sup>3</sup> Not a new addition! — E.d.



great number of compound words. The difficulty here lies in the stressing, as the following pairs, taken from the new edition, show: 'ha:dbeikt but 'ha:d'bɔild (Wyld has 'ha:d'beikt though); 'houmspæn but 'houm'meid; 'teiləmeid but 'houm'meid; 'ʃɒp,wɔ:kə but 'ʃɒp'windou. We should have been thankful for even more such compounds. Take 'bæ:ɓdikeik but 'bæ:ɓdi 'gri:tɪŋz; 'wedɪŋpreznt but 'wedɪŋ 'gift; 'krisməstri: but 'krisməs dɪnə. Then the compounds whose first element is a gerund: 'lɪvɪŋru:m but 'lɪvɪŋ kən'dɪfɪnz. With fɔ:lɪŋ siknis both ways of stressing seem to be possible.

Now the alterations. By comparing the old with the new entries, we can form a notion of the changing habits and fashions in English pronunciation. These are of course only a minor aspect of language evolution, the one that can be expressed by the limited number of symbols used in a dictionary. The main changes are those that make themselves felt with sounds as such, and are thus not recorded in dictionaries. Such a change is hinted at in the Introductory Explanations, p. xix, namely aɪə, auə > əə > ə:, ɑ:. But also the more accidental changes are worth calling attention to. There is for example an increasing tendency to use ɔ not ɔ: in words like cloth, loss, soft, etc., where ɔ: was the prevailing pronunciation twenty years ago. The ɔ: variant has practically disappeared with many of these words. — Then æ: is on the increase, especially before nasals, e.g. mæ:n, hæ:nd, græ:nd are given as variants of mæn, hænd, grænd. The word jam (subst.) is interesting. We are informed that some people say dʒæ:m for preserve, dʒæm for crush. The phonologists will make a note of this differentiation, because according to their definition æ and æ: are two different phonemes here<sup>4</sup>. — lu:- is now used in preference to -lju:- after an unstressed syllable, e.g. ə'lu:d, i'lu:sɪdeɪt. — With regard to the wavering between voiceless and voiced s, only remarks about individual words are possible. A few examples: Of the two possible pronunciations i'reis and i'reiz only the latter has survived; dɪ'zæn is now oftener dɪ'sæn; 'ju:zɪdʒ alternates with 'ju:sɪdʒ to-day; tə gri:z, tə mauz alternate with tə gri:s, tə maus. — Liaison r in compounds like feather edge, paper office is often left out to-day; a glottal stop can, but need not take its place. This corresponds to the often observed fact that also in the sentence, liaison r is sometimes omitted now, e.g. bi'fɔ: its 'reɪnɪŋ. — The process of vowel reduction, which is so characteristic of English, is still going on; go'rɪlə is now commonly gə'rɪlə, ɲjuərəs'pi:nɪə has become ɲjuərəs'pi:nɪə. There are a few examples of the reverse movement, of spelling pronunciation, as it is called: bade is now commonly pronounced beɪd, towards is pronounced tə'wɔ:dz. With Cornwall there is a variant 'kɔ:nwɔ:l.

The pronunciation of foreign words is instructive. With Latin words there is a distinct tendency to pronounce them more correctly, and not as if they were English words. The generations who at school learnt to say pe'keɪvai, 'vaɪnai'vaɪdai'vaɪsai are being superseded by those who pronounce pe'ka:vi:, 've:ni'vi:di:vi:ki. The same may be said of other foreign words: a:'ma:də, 'kælei, 'soufiə are now the common forms; a:'meɪdə, 'kælis, sə'faɪə have the remark "old-fashioned". A number of very common French words, on the other hand, are fast being assimilated, as others have been assimilated before. This tendency is favoured by the

<sup>4</sup> cf. also kləθs and kləθs.

B. B. C., which recommends to its announcers: 'ɔnwi:, 'dɔiən, 'fɔutil etc.

With stress the chief impression is one of considerable wavering, especially with less common words. No general tendency can be detected; with the new variants the place of the stress is sometimes further back and sometimes further advanced. A few examples: ə'lai (sb), ə'dʌlt, 'ɔbligətəri are being supplanted by 'ælai, 'ædʌlt, ɔ'bligətəri; besides 'a:mistis, 'diridzəbl, 'ekskwizit there are now the variants a'mistis, di'ridzəbl, eks'kwizit. With compound words there is a tendency to give up level in favour of single stress. This is the continuation of a line of development which has been pointed out before, for the first time by Sweet (N.E.G. I p. 286). Thus meinlənd has, tʃə:tʃja:d may have single stress, even when pronounced in isolation. Another instance in point would be the variant 'si:said. Then the place of the secondary stress with long words: It is either on the first (e.g., mɔdifi'keiʃn) or on the second syllable (e.g. ig,zæmi'neiʃn, prə,nənsi'eiʃn). Foreigners often mispronounce words of the latter type, giving the first syllable the secondary stress.<sup>5</sup> We learn from the new edition that this is actually possible with a few words now, thus ri:dʒenə'reiʃn, besides the more common ri,dʒenə'reiʃn; dissimilation is either 'disimi'leiʃn or ,disimi'leiʃn or di,simi'leiʃn.

With a number of entries there is no change of pronunciation, but additional information about the two or more variants. Many words are pronounced differently by different sets of people. Often the meaning of the two variants is not the same. Thus 'keinain is used chiefly in zoology, 'kənain in dentistry; lef'tenənt is used in the army, lu:'tenənt in the navy. Army and civilians are often not at one. The former sometimes say 'trɔfi, pu:tʃ for 'troufi, pauf. Then Church and laymen: there is a form 'noulidʒ used chiefly by the clergy. 'gaizə is a hot spring, 'gi:zə an apparatus for heating water. Proper names: 'bɔ:d 'bi:kənzfi:ld but 'bekənzfi:ld in Buckinghamshire; 'æni 'besənt but 'wɔ:lətə bi'zænt. Roosevelt is in England often pronounced 'ru:svelt, in the family of the President they say 'rouzəvelt. The present Sir Walter Raleigh says 'rɔ:li, the bicycles are called 'ræli. Galsworthy is commonly pronounced 'gɔ:lwə:ði, though the author himself is said to have used the form 'gælwə:ði. Jerome K. Jerome pronounced his name dʒə'roum.

Finally there are many new remarks about variants that are conditioned by the position of the word in the sentence; for example 'self'meid, in attributive position 'selfmeid; 'hai'maindid, under the influence of sentence stress also 'haimaindid and hai'maindid. Such remarks are on the borderline of what still belongs to a dictionary. In fact they are already in the domain of a systematic treatise on English phonetics, for they concern a general law, the law of rhythm, treated in § 932 seqq of the author's *Outline of English Phonetics*. This law is also applicable to words like 'self'wild, 'selfpə'zest, yet with them the variant is not noted. — The same remark applies to the cases of contrast stress, e.g. 'mænkaɪnd, 'ektə:nɪ. Why not also 'ri:vəs, 'æsendɪŋ, to quote only the examples from the author's *Outline* § 938? Why give the variant 'ɔilpeɪnt as contrast stress, 'ɔilfjuəl without such remark? Or rather: why mention contrast stress at all, since it figures in the introductory Explanations.

But this is a minor grievance and does not impair the value of the book,

<sup>5</sup> Cf. L. J. Guittart, 'Secondary Stress', E.S. XII (1930), pp. 31-34. — E.d.

which in its new form even more than in its old will be an indispensable work of reference for students of English both in England and abroad. Abroad above all, where learners and teachers alike are so often at a loss how to pronounce a word they have only seen in print, or which pronunciation to adopt when more than one seems admissible. The author's unquestioned competence in the science of phonetics, together with the great conscientiousness with which he sets about his task, make him the most trustworthy guide to English pronunciation.

Basel. —

MARIA SCHUBIGER.

## Current Literature 1936

### I. Fiction, Poetry and Drama

#### (Conclusion)

One or two other collections of recent verse also deserve attention. *Poems* by Michael Roberts (Cape, 5/—) is concerned mainly with the moral, spiritual and ethical implications of modern problems and social conditions. The language is highly figurative, much of the imagery being drawn from the author's experience as a mountaineer. *Twelve Noon*, by Richard Church (Dent, 2/6), on the other hand, expresses emotions and desires much more personal. In melodious and simple language Mr. Church writes of his joy in meditative solitude, in his home, in fields and in gardens. Something of the same love of solitude, too, is to be found in L. A. G. Strong's *Call to the Swan* (Hamish Hamilton, 5/—), though here the poet often drifts into pessimism, and a sense of destiny or the propinquity of death overshadows most of his verses. As an antidote to the gloom of this volume, however, there is Herbert E. Palmer's *The Vampire* (Dent, 3/6), a denunciation of the modern nostalgia as a symptom of irreligion and a lack of faith in God and man. Mr. Palmer is certainly a more hopeful poet than many today, but one sometimes feels that his diagnosis of twentieth century disillusion is a little too facile, while his style is apt to degenerate too frequently into the melodramatic on the one hand and the rhetorical on the other. The spirit of his early Methodist days, of which he speaks in *The Mistletoe Child*, has never completely left him.

*The Last Man and Other Verses* by Elizabeth Daryush (Oxford University Press, 5/—) has many of the characteristics of its author's earlier volume of *Verses* noticed in the survey for 1935. The intellectual quality noted there, for instance, is again in evidence; so are the depth of insight, the note of personal revelation, the sensitiveness to beauty, to colour, to movement. But there is also a difference. The subdued sadness of the earlier poems is deepened here, and sometimes, as in the long philosophical and metaphysical piece which gives the volume its title, comes near to pessimism. True, Mrs. Daryush can enter with sympathy into the mind of the young heiress in *Still Life*, who returns from a morning walk,

Feeling that life's a table set to bless  
Her delicate desires with all that's good,  
That even the unopened future lies  
Like a love-letter, full of sweet surprise.



But even in such a verse as this one seems to detect a note of pity for youthful innocence, so soon to meet with disappointment. For the most part a sense of destiny broods over these poems. The writer cannot forget that life is but a stage in eternity, and to fortify herself against its buffets she adopts an attitude of stoical patience and courage. Is there a purpose behind existence? There may be. She comes near to discerning one in the poem which closes the volume, but it is all very vague and indefinite, a question which is left unanswered.

God is travail, who from eternity  
 Words his immortal might in mortal war,  
 In troubled atom, fiery trembling star —  
 Heaven, earth, is his poem, of whom are we  
 Who fear to perish until we have our souls portrayed...  
 What else should life mean, to man in his image made?

Obscurity is not altogether absent from Mrs. Daryush's works; in the title-poem particularly it appears, and now and again she falls into an impressionistic style; but usually her imagery is well defined and clear-cut, her language direct and forceful.

With the publication of a small volume of verses in 1930 W. H. Auden was immediately acclaimed as one of the poets of the future. He has now made a further selection from the non-dramatic verse which he has written during the past six years, and presents it under the title *Look, Stranger!* (Faber & Faber, 5/—). From Mr. Auden one would scarcely expect poetry of the care-free, optimistic type. His work, like Eliot's, is the product of an age of disillusion, and it is the spirit of disillusion and of frustrated effort that broods over this book. Both the prologue and the epilogue are characterised by that grim raillery which is a marked trait of the author's latest dramatic pieces, while the verses are for the most part an indictment of modern civilisation, which has achieved so little from so great possibilities, mainly because of the absence of any real spiritual impetus. One gathers that to Mr. Auden the last few years have been a period blighted by a kind of selfish apathy. He protests against war, nationalism, militarism; against the mechanisation of life, the examination system, the armament rings; against the squalor, the stunted life and the materialism of the great cities, all of them the outcome of a distorted sense of values. One must confess that the poet sometimes seems to let his *sæva indignatio* outrun all bounds, so that he appears a somewhat disgruntled pessimist; but happily the gloom is relieved by his semi-facetious style.

So far as anthologies go, foremost place must be given to *The Oxford Book of Modern Verse*, edited by W. B. Yeats (Oxford University Press, 8/6), with which the series of Oxford Books, from the sixteenth century onwards, is brought to a close. Mr. Yeats has written a long introduction in which he gives his own views and impressions of the verse produced from the death of Tennyson to the present day; and considering the diversity of types represented in this period, and the very individual tone and character of Mr. Yeats' own work, it is somewhat re-assuring to read that, "England has had more good poets from 1900 to the present day than during any period of the same length since the early seventeenth century." Altogether 378 poems are printed, by 98 authors, and amongst them the reader will probably find a number unfamiliar to him. Even in the cases of the better known writers-surprises await us, for it is not always the

favourites of the anthologists that the editor has selected. Indeed, it is probably no exaggeration to say that more than half the pieces included here have appeared in no other collection of modern verse. Nor is the selection confined strictly to English poets. It is perhaps only natural that Mr. Yeats should show a predilection for the verse of his own countrymen, who are well represented both by their English poetry and by translations; one or two pieces from beyond the Atlantic have been admitted, too, while there are also a few extracts from Rabindranath Tagore. It is a pity that Sir William Watson had to be excluded, but that was not the fault of the editor. One feels, too, that Rupert Brooke, Sir John Squire and John Drinkwater have scarcely received the recognition they deserve, as compared with some of the younger writers of today; but anthology making is, after all, very much a matter of personal taste. *The Oxford Book of Modern Verse* may not be faultless, but it is catholic in scope and in all respects worthy of its predecessors in the series.

Next in importance to this I should put *The Progress of Poetry. An Anthology of Verse from Hardy to the Present Day*, edited by I. M. Parsons (Chatto & Windus, 5/—). It covers roughly the same period as Mr. Yeats' book, though the two editors differ considerably in their opinions of what is representative in the verse of the last half-century. Mr. Parsons leans rather more towards the modern metaphysicals than does Mr. Yeats. So far as choice of verse is concerned I think I prefer the latter, though Mr. Parsons' introductory sketch gives an admirable outline of the development of poetry over the period in question and the main tendencies observable in recent times. And finally there is also *The Faber Book of Modern Poetry*, edited by Michael Roberts (Faber & Faber, 7/6), and designed as an anthology from Gerard Manly Hopkins to the present day. Mr. Roberts' partiality is for the "modernist" school. In a prefatory note he states that he has included "only poems which seem to add to the resources of poetry and to be likely to influence the future development of poetry and language", and it is therefore significant that writers like Walter de la Mare, Edmund Blunden, Sir William Watson and John Masefield, who all fall within the period, are omitted altogether, while a number of American poets who are more often talked of than read by the average "modern" find an honourable place. But if a reader is inclined to quarrel with Mr. Roberts' selection he will at least find his introduction (which runs to thirty-five pages) most illuminating and interesting; and of course, the book should be regarded as complementary rather than alternative to the previous two.

If the year has so much to show in poetry, in drama the same claim cannot be made. Few memorable plays have been produced. The only collected edition of any note is *Tonight at Eight-Thirty*, by Noel Coward (Heinemann, 3 vols., 3/6 per vol.). In the nine pieces here assembled<sup>2</sup> Mr. Coward is represented in all his moods — the jocular and the serious, the witty and the ironic, the fantastic, the disillusioned and the sentimental. None of the plays is very long; all are characterised by a brilliant display

---

<sup>2</sup> *We Were Dancing, The Astonished Heart, Red Peppers, Hands Across the Sea, Fumed Oak, Shadow Play, Ways and Means, Still Life, Family Album.*

<sup>3</sup> and last, the author having died on March 25, 1937, after these lines were written.

of repartee which can only really become effective when spoken on the stage, so that it is unfair to judge their merits upon the impression gained by reading them. Suffice it to say that all have been performed and that in the theatre all have taken well.

John Drinkwater's new<sup>3</sup> chronicle play *Garibaldi* (Sidgwick & Jackson, 3/6), founded upon the exploits of the Italian patriot from the Young Italy days of 1834 to the establishment of the Kingdom of Italy in 1860, is a rather disappointing piece of work. The action is diffuse and the ten scenes into which the play is divided are rather like disconnected episodes. The characters are neither remarkable nor very convincing, the dialogue is lacking in verve and passion, while the skilful use of dramatic situation to illuminate personality, so familiar to readers of *Abraham Lincoln* and *Oliver Cromwell*, is absent from the present play. Nor is there distinguishable any central idea or ruling emotion. In short, the poetic quality and the heroic, spiritual conception which made Mr. Drinkwater's earlier plays the masterpieces that they are, are lacking in the present work — at least, so far as a reader is concerned — and because of this *Garibaldi* cannot be called a success.

Bernard Shaw still continues to write. *The Simpleton*, *The Six* and *The Millionairess* (Constable, 7/6) represent his latest contribution to the stage, though one must confess that all three seem to show a falling-off in dramatic power. *The Simpleton* (or *The Simpleton of the Unexpected Isles*, as the full title is) urges the right of a ruling party to "liquidate" awkward opponents who threaten to sabotage social and political schemes. *The Six of Calais* gives the author an opportunity of re-touching the historical portrait of Edward III, while *The Millionairess* is an exposure of the shortcomings of democracy and its exploitation by the moneyed classes. This is not the Bernard Shaw that we once knew; his faith in the Superman seems to be burning a little dim in these days. Of course, the expression of disgust and disappointment at the apparent failure of democratic institutions will occasion no surprise to those who have read his last two or three plays; the pity is that he offers no solution to the problem that he discloses. The preface, too, contains a good deal of confused thinking. When the term "Communist", for instance, is used to describe two men so far apart as Jesus, whose appeal was almost solely to the spiritual, and Lenin, whose outlook was mainly conditioned by economic doctrines, it becomes so general and comprehensive as to be meaningless.

The revival of the poetic drama, a significant characteristic of our age, has produced several noteworthy plays. A good example is S. R. Lysaght's *The Immortal Jew* (Macmillan, 3/6). It is not a new work, having first appeared in 1931, but it has recently been included in the Eversley Series and attention has been attracted to it anew, so as it has never found a place in any of these surveys it does not seem inappropriate to mention it here. I have called it a poetic drama, and the treatment of the theme, as well as the language, justifies that description, though actually the greater part of the dialogue is in rhythmic prose. The theme is that of the Wandering Jew. Instead of following the traditional story, however, and making him live on for two thousand years, Mr. Lysaght has imagined his Jew continually re-appearing upon the earth in different incarnations. In each of his lives he commits the sin of betraying love for the sake of self, and every time, just when he feels that he has risen triumphant over the pangs



of conscience, and has shewn himself the strong man, daring to defy the moral law, a vision of his former life arises to haunt him, and he is driven forth to death and shame. But there is a note of hope at the end, as he sinks into unconsciousness while the choir of a neighbouring church chants a Christmas hymn.

Obviously the play is much more than another dramatisation of the age-long story of the wanderings and sufferings of him who rejected Jesus. It is a philosophic play, and raises big problems of heredity, of sin and repentance and of immortality. One feels rather doubtful of its merits as a stage piece. To begin with, it is over long; the constant repetition of the same theme in different terms is apt to become a little monotonous, while the lack of variety in the rhythm of the prose dialogue would probably produce a deadening effect when accentuated by the speaking voice. But in the study these defects are not so obvious.

Charles Williams' *Thomas Cranmer of Canterbury* (Oxford University Press, 3/6) is obviously inspired by T. S. Eliot's *Murder in the Cathedral*. The themes of both plays are similar; so are the methods of treatment and the general technique, though one cannot feel that Mr. Williams' is so powerful a drama as was its predecessor. Cranmer, as he is depicted here, has neither the spiritual pre-eminence nor the dramatic grandeur of Mr. Eliot's Becket; but the issues which the two Archbishops have to face are substantially the same, even if the immediate circumstances are different. Mr. Williams' drama opens in 1528, when Cranmer is at Cambridge, a scholar of great hope and promise; it ends with his martyrdom in 1556, and through those twenty-eight years it shows on the one hand the reaction of Cranmer's mind towards the world — his temptation to renounce the path of truth and right for the easy way, and then his final triumph in martyrdom — and on the other the changing attitude of the world towards Cranmer and the Church which he represents. The two motives, naturally, cross and re-cross, each of them influencing the other. As in Mr. Eliot's play, a Chorus is used as a commentator, passages of the Anglican liturgy are cleverly worked into the verse, while Truth is represented by a grim skeleton who forces himself upon the Archbishop as mentor. Cranmer himself strikes us as just an average man who becomes a hero by force of circumstances; that perhaps is the main difference between him and Becket. But there is a difference, too, in the final conflict, for where Becket falls a victim to temporal pride and power, symbolised in the throne, and dies as a champion of the commonweal, Cranmer finds himself opposed by the very world which he has tried to redeem from intellectual and spiritual darkness. It is the old story of the martyrdom of Love and Truth at the hands of Prejudice, Greed and Folly.

For the last few years Mr. Cecil Day Lewis has been assiduously blazing the trail of Communism in his verses and dramatic poems. Now, under the title of *Noah and the Waters* (Hogarth Press, 5/—), he has written a modern morality play on the subject of the coming revolution, which, he feels, is bound to break upon us before long. He takes as his starting-point a passage from the *Communist Manifesto*:

When the class-war is about to be fought to a finish, the disintegration of the ruling class and the old order of society becomes so active that a small part of the ruling class breaks away to make common cause with the revolutionary class, the class which holds the future in its hands.

This is the theme of his play. All the characters are symbolic. The Flood, obviously, is the rising tide of Communism. Then there are three Burghers, representative of society as at present constituted, who do all in their power to oppose the flood, even to the extent of enlisting all the other elements, as well as the power of science, upon their side, and making war upon it; but they are finally overwhelmed. And last there is Noah, the more discerning *bourgeois*, who bows to the inevitable, retires into his ark, and when the waters have subsided sees a fairer world than that he had known before. In point of style this piece is unlike Mr. Day Lewis' earlier work; there are definite traces of the influence of W. H. Auden. Indeed, technically there is a marked resemblance to *The Dance of Death*, though the symbolism is never so obscure as that of Mr. Auden, nor does the author so frequently descend to doggerel; but there is the same insistence upon idea, the same employment of the chorus, the same mixture of poetry and rhetoric. Mr. Lewis admits that his play is probably not suitable for the modern stage, and most readers will concur in that opinion. It is, in fact, a political allegory rather than a dramatic piece.

Sheffield.

FREDERICK T. WOOD.

### Brief Mention

*Broadcast English II. Recommendations to Announcers Regarding the Pronunciation of Some English Place-Names. Collected and Transcribed for the B.B.C. Advisory Committee on Spoken English by A. LLOYD JAMES. Second edition. 87 pp. London: British Broadcasting Corporation. 1936.*

This booklet furnishes "announcers" with a very extensive supply of pronunciations of place-names. The list gives first the usual spelling, then a phonetic transcription and lastly a representation of the sounds "by means of a modified spelling". *Apuldrum*, Sussex, e.g., is rendered phonetically by 'æpldr̥m and in the second list by 'appēldr̥m. It is hardly necessary to point out the usefulness of such a work, both to Englishmen and foreigners. The latter will only regret the absence of many well-known names (Plymouth, Portsmouth, Warwick, Worcester, ...) the pronunciation of which is familiar to all Englishmen but not always easy to discover in the current handbooks of phonetics. The interesting Introduction acquaints the reader with the many difficulties one meets when trying to decide which pronunciation must be considered "current" or "normal". In many cases the Editor was obliged to admit two different pronunciations as equally acceptable. — J. M.

## Bibliography

### HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM (Eighteenth Century and After)

- Tides in English Taste (1619-1800). A Background for the Study of Literature.* By B. SPRAGUE ALLEN. Harvard University Press. London: Milford. 2 vols. 34s.  
*Architecture in English Fiction.* By R. H. SMITH. Yale University Press. London: Milford. 11s. 6d.

*Chinese Influence on European Garden Structures.* By E. VON ERDBERG. Harvard University Press. London: Milford. 21s.

*Bishop Butler and the Age of Reason.* By E. C. MOSSNER. xv + 271 pp. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1936. \$2.50. [A review will appear.]

*John Locke and English Literature of the Eighteenth Century.* By K. MACLEAN. viii + 176 pp. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Milford. 11s. 6d.

*Samuel Richardson, Printer and Novelist.* By A. D. MACKILLOP. xii + 357 pp. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. London: Milford. 18s.

*Samuel Richardson.* A Bibliographical Record of his Literary Career with Historical Notes. By W. M. SALE, JR. Yale University Press. London: Milford. 22s. 6d.

*Aspects of Eighteenth Century Nature Poetry.* By C. V. DEANE. Oxford: Blackwell. 7s. 6d.

*Beckford.* By GUY CHAPMAN. Cape. 15s.

*John Galt.* By J. W. ABERDEIN. xxiv + 209 pp. London: Oxford University Press.

*The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth.* The Middle Years. Arranged and edited by E. DE SELINCOURT. In 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 42s. the 2 vols.

*Coleridge's Miscellaneous Criticism.* By Th. M. RAYSOR. xvi + 468 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

*Byron. The Years of Fame.* By P. QUENNELL. 383 pp. London: Faber & Faber. 1935. 15s. net. [See Review, Dec. 1936.]

*Religiöse Probleme bei Lord Byron.* Von E. SCHULT. 77 pp. Diss. Hamburg.

*Thomas Moore.* By E. MACCALL. (Noted Irish Lives.) 132 pp. London: Duckworth. Dublin: The Talbot Press. 1935. 2s. 6d. [A review will appear.]

*Life of John Keats.* By CHARLES ARMITAGE BROWN. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by D. H. BODURTHA and W. B. POPE. Oxford University Press. London: Milford. 6s.

*Adonais.* A Life of John Keats. By DOROTHY HEWLETT. Hurst and Blackett. 15s.

*The Evolution of Keats's Poetry.* By C. L. FINNEY. 2 vols. xx + 405, 406-804 pp. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press.

*The Letters of John Keats.* Edited by M. BUXTON FORMAN. Second edition with revisions and additional letters. lxi + 561 pp. London: Milford. 1935. 12s. 6d.

*John Keats and Fanny Brawne.* Letters of Fanny Brawne to Fanny Keats (1820-1824). Edited by F. EDGEUMBE, resident curator of the Keats Memorial House, Hampstead. London. 128 pp. New York: Oxford University Press \$3.—.

*Studies in Shelley.* By A. SEN. xvi + 343 pp. Calcutta: Calcutta University Press.

*A Study of Shelley's 'Defence of Poetry'.* By L. VERKOREN. 163 pp. Amsterdam diss. 1937. (Privately printed.) [A review will appear.]

*The Letters of Sir Walter Scott.* Edited by H. J. C. GRIERSON. Centenary Edition. Vol. IX, 1825-1826. xvi + 510 pp. Vol. X, 1827-1828. xix + 512 pp. London: Constable. 1935, 1936. 18s. net each vol. [See Review, June 1937.]

*The Letters of Sir Walter Scott.* Edited by SIR HERBERT GRIERSON. Centenary Edition. Vol. XI, 1828-1831. xviii + 496 pp. Vol. XII (Final Volume), 1831-1832. xii + 520 pp. London: Constable. 1936, 1937. 18s. net each vol. [A review will appear.]

*Jane Austen.* By LORD DAVID CECIL. The Leslie Stephen Lecture delivered before the University of Cambridge on May 1, 1935. Cambridge University Press. 1s. 6d.

*De Quincey.* By M. ELWIN. (Great Lives.) Duckworth. 2s.

*A Flame in Sunlight.* The Life and Work of Thomas de Quincey. By E. SACKVILLE WEST. xiii + 352 pp. London: Cassell. 1936. 15s. net. [See Review.]



# The Tale of Geat and Mæðhild

dedicated to Holger Pedersen, on his seventieth birthday

The story with which this paper deals is known to us from two sources: a passage (lines 14-17) in the OE poem *Deor*, and a Scandinavian ballad. The *Deor* passage is short, and not easy to interpret. The ballad however gives us the story in full. The following summaries of the plot of the ballad will suffice for our present purpose: <sup>1</sup>

## Norwegian Version (Landstad, No. 51)

Gaute marries a fair maiden, Magnild by name. As the wedding journey is about to begin, Gaute sees his bride in tears. He asks her why she weeps. Magnild answers that she laments her approaching death in the Vending river. Gaute tells her he will build the bridge over the river high and strong, but she replies that one cannot escape one's fate. As they ride homeward they see a deer, and everyone, eager to take it, forgets the bride, who, at the bridge, falls into the water. Gaute, when he learns that Magnild has not been seen since the company crossed the stream, sends for his harp. When the harp is brought to him, he plays so strongly that Magnild, with her saddle and her horse, rises to the surface of the stream, in spite of everything the waterdemon can do. By the magic power of his harp, Gaute has overcome the evil spirit and saved his bride from death.

## Icelandic Version (Grundtvig and Sigurðsson, No. 3)

Gauti and Magnhild his wife lie in bed together. He asks her why she mourns. She answers, she mourns because she is fated to drown in the Skotberg river. He tells her she shall not drown in the river, because he will make an iron bridge across it. She replies, "Though thou make it as high as a cloud, none can flee one's fate." After three days of feasting [the wedding feast?], they ride to the river. Gauti asks his man what has become of Magnhild. He is told that the bridge fell apart when she reached its middle, and that 50 men fell in but none paid any heed to Magnhild. Gauti asks for his harp. When it is brought he hurls it to the floor, so that 12 strings break. He hurls it again, and five more strings break. Then he plays upon it until his wife's body rises from the bottom and comes to land. He kisses his dead wife, buries her body, and makes new strings for his harp out of her hair.

These versions belong to a ballad-group called *Harpens Kraft* in the great Danish collection of Grundtvig. In the other versions of the group, the lovers have other names, and the course of events varies more or less from version to version. Here we shall concern ourselves wholly with *Deor* and the ballad versions summarized above. In other words, we shall restrict our study to those parts of the literary material which are definitely linked by a correspondence in the names of the characters.<sup>2</sup>

Our *Deor* passage reads as follows (I quote from my edition of 1933):

---

<sup>1</sup> These summaries are taken from my paper of 1936 (*ELH* III, 253 ff.), in which I pointed out (for the first time) the connexion between the *Deor* passage and the Scandinavian ballad.

<sup>2</sup> F. Norman, in a vigorous paper (*MLR* XXXII, 374 ff.), attacks the propriety or at any rate the wisdom of such a restriction, and in his own attempt to explain the *Deor* passage he ignores the evidence afforded by the ballads. To me this attitude seems thoroughly wrongheaded.

- |    |                     |                   |
|----|---------------------|-------------------|
| 14 | We þæt Mæðhilde     | monge gefrugnon   |
|    | wurdon grundlease   | Geates frige,     |
|    | þæt hi seo sorglufu | slæp ealle binom. |
|    | Ðæs ofereode;       | þisses swa mæg.   |

Here let us first consider the names. The man's name, *Geat*, answers with precision to the Icelandic *Gauti*, except for the inflexion, which is weak in *Gauti* but strong in *Geat*. This difference need not disturb us; as everybody knows, such variations in inflexion are common enough. Thus, in *Beowulf* the name of the father of Hygelac is inflected, now strong, now weak. The women's names, *Mæðhild* and *Magnhild*, obviously do not correspond with such precision. Their second elements are the same, but their first elements, though like, are not identical. The element *magn* means 'might, power, strength.' The meaning of the corresponding English *mæð* is uncertain. Holthausen, in his OE etymological dictionary, records a word *mægð* 'macht, grösse,' and in WS the *g* of this word might be lost, with lengthening of the preceding vowel, giving the very form which we have here. If this is the true connexion for the *mæð* of *mæðhild*, then this element would be identical, in meaning if not in form, with the Icelandic *magn*. Unluckily I have found no trace of Holthausen's word outside his dictionary, and the actual occurrence of the word in OE cannot be presumed. In any case, the correspondence between *Mæðhild* and *Magnhild*, coupled with that between *Geat* and *Gauti*, can hardly be dismissed as accidental and without significance. We are justified (*pace* Norman) in proceeding further, from name to tale, in order to find out, if possible, whether the correspondence in names is accompanied by a correspondence in story.

Ordinarily such a task would be simple enough. Here it is complicated by our difficulty in determining the meaning of the *Deor* passage. We must begin, then, with those features of the story about which there can be no doubt or question. The pattern of *Deor* as a whole can be used, of course, to throw light on the particular passage with which we are now especially concerned. This pattern is perfectly clear. Each section deals with adversity. One of the sections (lines 28-34) considers adversity in general, and will here be called the *General* section. The other sections have to do with particular pieces or periods of adversity; to each of them is appended the information that such adversity passed. In other words, each section constitutes an allusion to a tale of misfortune with a happy ending. If we set aside our passage (lines 14 ff.), we find that all but one of the other sections specify the victim of misfortune at the beginning of the section: Welund in line 1, Beadohild in line 8, ðeodric in line 18, "the sorrowful one" in line 28, and *me sylfum* (i.e. *Deor*) in line 35. The chances are, then, that the same rule holds in our passage. *Mæðhild* in all likelihood is the victim, and her misfortunes may be expected to pass in the end. If now we turn to the ballad, we find that *Magnhild* is the victim of misfortune in both versions: the ending is happy in the Norwegian version, unhappy in the Icelandic. Here then the Norwegian version of the ballad is in agreement with the *Deor* passage.

Of what misfortune is the lady the victim? The *Deor* passage gives us an answer, coupled with a detail. Line 16 can be taken in more ways than one, but if we follow Stefanović (*Anglia* XXXIII, 398) it means 'so that that sorrow-love deprived her of all sleep' (similarly Norman). Love, then, lies at the root of *Mæðhild*'s troubles. In particular, she cannot sleep.

What do we learn from the ballads? In the Norwegian ballad, Magnild's laments are connected with the wedding journey. By marrying Gaute she has offended the water-demon, and she feels certain the demon will kill her. Her own love for Gaute has led her into a situation perilous indeed; the demon's love for her threatens to become her bane. All this is perfectly consistent with the *Deor* passage. Love is indeed linked with sorrow in the Norwegian ballad. And when we turn to the Icelandic version, we find the interesting detail that Magnhild lies in bed mourning instead of sleeping. So far, then, everything fits, and we have good reason to think that the *Deor* poet in our passage is alluding to the tale told in the ballads.

Let us now consider line 15 of the *Deor* passage. Here our discussion must center about the difficult word *frige*. In the revised edition of Grein's *Sprachschatz* (1912), the editors quote line 15 as an example (not elsewhere recorded) of the nom. pl. of a fem. noun meaning 'love.' They also give one example each of the gen. and dat., and two of the acc. pl. of this word. No occurrences in the singular are listed, and the word is marked as a pl. Norman (p. 380) takes *frige* in much the same sense, translating it with 'passion' and remarking that it "refers to a man's love-passion." If however we examine the actual passages, we find at once that everywhere except in *Deor* the word means something much more precise than love or passion; it is a name for the sexual act itself, or, rather, for the man's part in this act. The two *Christ* passages (lines 37 and 419) and the *Elene* passage (line 341) deal specifically with copulation and its natural effect, viz., the impregnation of the woman. In the *Juliana* passage (line 103) the reference is to conjugal love in its fleshly aspect, a cohabitation which the saintly lady will not agree to unless her "bridegroom" agrees to turn Christian.<sup>3</sup> A. S. Cook, in his edition of *Christ*, discreetly but not inaccurately glosses *frige* as 'embraces.' His euphemism may be compared with the Frenchman's *baiser* for the sexual act.<sup>4</sup> The thing to which OE *frige* gives name may be spoken of in a perfectly dignified way, of course, and it is actually so spoken of in the passages discussed above, passages which could not give offense to anyone. If we introduce it into the *Deor* passage, however, as Norman and his fellows (of whom I was one in 1933) so thoughtlessly have done, we turn the passage at once into gross comedy, something wholly out of keeping with the tone and purpose of the poem and not for a moment to be considered. The poet certainly did not intend to say that Geat's copulatory movements became boundless, depriving Mæðhild of all sleep. We must obviously seek another connexion for the *frige* of the *Deor* passage.

In my paper of 1936, I connected *frige* with OE *freo* 'wife' or 'woman,' a word which occurs in *Genesis* 457, with reference to Eve in the Garden of Eden. Holthausen in his OE etymological dictionary records this word as a fem. noun, and connects it with the adj. *freo* 'free,' as also with the gen. sg. *frige* in *Frige dæg* 'Friday' etc. If it is a jō-stem, as it seems to be, its gen. sg. would be *frige*, and *Geates frige* would mean 'of Geat's wife' or 'of Geat's dear one.' The following note in the NED under *free* adj. has a bearing here:

<sup>3</sup> Here *frige* varies with *eadlufe*, a term which in the *Sprachschatz* is rendered *amor* (conjugalis). Compare our expression "wedded bliss."

<sup>4</sup> The modern English vb. *frig.* said of the male's sexual act, with or without a partner, looks akin to OE *frige*, and is in fact derivable from the same base.



The primary sense of the adj. is 'dear'; the Germanic and Celtic sense comes of its having been applied as the distinctive epithet of those members of the household who were connected by ties of kindred with the head, as opposed to the slaves. The converse process of sense-development appears in Lat. *liberi* 'children,' literally the 'free' members of the household.

If *freo* adj. was used of a man's wife and children (as against his slaves), it might, later on, have become restricted to the wife, much as Latin *liberi* came to be restricted to the children. In this way a substantive *freo* 'wife' might have come into existence. The *freo* of *Genesis* 457 is usually glossed as 'woman', but since Adam and Eve are spoken of together in the passage it seems more natural to take *freo* in the sense 'wife.' On the phonology of the gen. (as against the nom.) form, see Luick, *Gram.*, p. 118 bottom. In the *Genesis* passage, *freo* seems to be acc. The use of the nom. form as an acc. is a Northumbrian peculiarity; see Sievers, *Gram.*, p. 131 (Anm. 5). Turning now to the ballads, we find no concern there with copulation, and we learn that Magnhild is Gauti's wife. Again the English text shows agreement with the story as told in the ballads.

We still have the task of finding out what things became boundless (*wurdon grundlease*). Since *frige* means 'wife' it does not help us here, and the only word in the passage which can throw light on this mystery is the mysterious *monge* of line 14. The *Mæðhilde* of the same line is presumably a gen., and the other gen., *Geates frige*, is to be taken as a variation of *Mæðhilde*.<sup>5</sup> What does *monge* mean? Let us make a survey of the other sections of the poem, and see if we can there find any clues which will help us to determine the meaning of the unknown quantity in the statement, "Mæðhild's *monge* became boundless." According to section 1, Welund experienced persecution, bore hardship etc. In section 2 we read that Beadohild was sore at heart. Section 4 tells us that Theodric held a certain stronghold for 30 years. From section 5 we learn that Ermanric's wolfishness made trouble for his subjects. In section 6 is pictured a man unhappy and sorrowful. Section 7 sketches the story of a poet who lost his post and his property. In two of these sections (4 and 7), we find no statement that the victim is sorrowful; the events are allowed to speak for themselves. In the other sections, however, the outward and inward sorrows of the victims are made much of. The *monge* of section 3, then, probably means sorrows, misfortunes, sufferings, tears, sighs, sobs or the like. "Mæðhild's griefs became boundless" would make excellent sense, and the pattern of the poem as a whole demands some such statement.

What information can the ballads give us on the point? In them, Magnhild expects to die. She knows where and how death will come to her, and her despair is not softened by the slightest ray of hope. She feels herself doomed. And yet she is not resigned to her fate. On the contrary, she breaks forth in tears and lamentations. Her grief may well be described as boundless or bottomless, for not only must she lose her life, but death will cut her off at the very time when she might reasonably expect to be most happy; she is doomed to die on her wedding journey. The evidence of the ballads, then, confirms the conclusion to which we had already come through our survey of the various sections of *Deor*. The word *monge* must be considered anew in the light of this conclusion.

<sup>5</sup> Norman raises a stylistic objection to this interpretation (the two variations are too far apart), but he scrupulously points out another variation in *Deor* (*hine* 5a / *syllan monn* 6b) in which the distance between the members is as great; further comment seems needless.

If *monge* is a plural form, it must mean 'many,' but this meaning obviously does not fit the context. It follows that emendation must be resorted to. As it happens, the word-sequence *monge gefrugnon* with which line 14 ends may well contain a piece of dittography: an earlier reading *mon ge frugnon* or the like may lie behind the reading of the extant text. Klaeber long ago suggested that this *mon* be emended to *man*, and in 1926 he pointed out that "a scribal alteration of a to o before a nasal would be entirely natural in this MS" (*Anglia* L, 121, note 1). Klaeber's *mán*, however, means 'crime, wickedness,' and such a meaning does not fit the context. It remains to consider another OE *mán* 'complaint, lament.' This word is not recorded in OE (apart from the *Deor* passage now under discussion), but its existence in the language from the earliest times is regularly taken for granted by the etymologists. Thus, in the NED, under *moan* sb. 'complaint, lamentation,' we find the following etymological statement:

app. repr. an unrecorded OE \**mán* ... The sb. cannot well be identified with OE *mán* wickedness ...; perhaps its phonetic coincidence with this may be the cause of its being unrecorded in OE. ...

It is easy to prove that OE *mán* 'complaint' existed in the language in prehistoric times: its OE derivative, the denominative verb *mænan* 'complain', shows i-mutation. And since ME *mān*, *mōn* occurs in the same sense, one cannot say that the OE word ever ceased to be current. Writers, however, evidently avoided it, perhaps to prevent confusion with *mán* 'wickedness,' as suggested above. *Deor* as a poem is marked throughout by independence and originality, and it is not surprising to find the poet going his own way in vocabulary as in other matters. The meaning 'lamentation' obviously fits our passage perfectly, and agrees with the statements in the ballads about Magnhild's tears and mourning. I conceive that the original reading was *mane gefrugnon*. A later copyist wrote *mange gefrugnon*, making the same mistake that the Exeter Book scribe himself made in *Bi Domes Dæge* 74 (*mongegum* for *monegum*). The extant *monge* we owe to the Exeter Book scribe (see Klaeber's note above). Klaeber in his note likewise assumes a series of three. This series seems unduly long to Norman, who says, "it is difficult to credit that the English of the tenth century were so addicted to copying out secular verse" (377). Yet a good deal of "secular" verse has come down to us, including *Beowulf*, and the great mixture of dialectal forms in much of this verse is usually explained on the theory that the poems were copied many times over. Indeed, if *Deor* was not copied as often as twice in a quarter of a century (the period of time which Norman thinks so short), then the poem can hardly be said to have had any currency worth speaking of among the poet's contemporaries, and its inclusion in that great miscellany, the Exeter Book, must be explained, not in the orthodox way, as an evidence of its popularity in the tenth century, but rather in terms of accident or aberrant taste. Norman's own high opinion of *Deor* (which I share) is not easy to reconcile with his belief that it had so little written currency. And his notion that the author of the poem did not bother to write it down is hard to take seriously. The *Deor* poet was presumably a priest or monk. His poem includes a religious passage (lines 28-34) which shows that he was at home in the "book-verse" of the clergy. The secular matter is not

presented for its own sake, but for the sake of the moral. The poet surely thought of his verses, not as entertainment but as instruction. Through this poem he was teaching others to be patient under affliction and to have trust in God, however great their misfortunes. Our own interest in *Deor* lies elsewhere: in its Germanic allusions and in its qualities as a work of art. Hence Norman can call it secular, and, for us, secular it undoubtedly is. But the tenth century thought otherwise. Unless I am greatly mistaken, the *Deor* poet felt his poem worthy of written record as a work of edification and instruction, and I see no reason to doubt that he himself wrote it down in a book, although of course there is no way of proving that he did so. It is natural, proper and customary for authors to commit to writing (if they can) such compositions of theirs as they deem worthy of preservation. Why should the *Deor* poet be considered an exception to the general rule? <sup>6</sup>

Our *Deor* passage, then, may be put into modern English as follows:

We learned that the lamentations of Mæðhild, Geat's wife, became boundless, so that that sorrow-love deprived her of all sleep. That passed; so can this.

The rendering, however, is smoother than need be, and though it gives the meaning of the OE text, it does not reproduce the stylistic effect of the verses. Translated word for word, lines 14-16 would appear thus (words to be understood are added in brackets, to make things easier for the modern reader; in the tenth century no such help would have been needed, of course):

line 14: We that, [namely] Mæðhild's lamentations, learned :  
 line 15: [They] became boundless, [the lamentations] of Geat's wife,  
 line 16: That her that sorrow-love of sleep all deprived.

The word-order here is reminiscent of Skaldic technic, but it does not depart from the principles that govern the word-order of OE poetry (as of Old-Germanic poetry generally). To me the lines are beautiful; only a master poet could have written them, I think.

The Scandinavian ballad has yet more to teach us about the English poem. Though nobody, so far as I know, has ever maintained that in *Deor* we were "dealing with a number of heroic references strung together like beads on a string" (Norman, p. 379), it remains true that we are not told, and have found it hard to fathom, why the poet chose this tale and not that. Clearly he had no hard and fast pattern to go by, but just as clearly he proceeded within the limits set by the lesson he wished to teach and the method he followed in its teaching. This method was that of the exemplum. We cannot call *Deor* a sermon, but its author was surely influenced by the exemplum technic so familiar in medieval sermons. The particular tales that he could use as exempla were those in which misfortune came but went at last. Many such tales were known to him, of course. Of these, he made a selection. How did he go about his choosing? He began with Welund, we may surmise, because Welund's case was so famous

<sup>6</sup> It is perhaps not needful to insist on circa 950 as the date of composition of *Deor*. In my previous paper, I called attention to A. G. van Hamel's remarks (*ANF* XLV, 150) on "the old balladic style" in Old Norse. I might also have quoted Klaeber's reference (in his edition of *Beowulf*) to "the more primitive ballads which must be presumed to have existed in large numbers in early Anglo-Saxon times" (1st ed., p. cvi; 3d ed., p. ciii).



and so much to the point. He continued with Beadohild for reasons too obvious to call for mention here. Next comes Mæðhild. Why? The psychological process which brought her name to the fore was presumably that commonly known as the association of ideas. The bond of sex, and the likeness of name, might well be enough to bring about an association, in the poet's mind, of Beadohild and Mæðhild. But the ballad points to a further link. Beadohild was the victim of a demonic creature, neither god nor man: Welund the elf. Mæðhild likewise, according to the ballad, fell victim to the malice of a demon. She has good right, therefore, to her place in *Deor*.

Let us proceed. Mæðhild's husband Geat is mentioned by name in the passage, if only in a kenning, and his name naturally reminds the poet of the Geatas, and so of that great enemy of the Geatas, the Frankish king, Theodric, whose army defeated and killed the Geatish king Hygelac in a battle famous throughout the North. The tale of Hygelac, with its tragic ending, could not be used by the *Deor* poet (nor could the tale of Beowulf), but Theodric and his putative son of the same name, the Hugdietrich and Wolfdietrich of German story, gave him another exemplum: lines 18-20 allude to Wolfdietrich's long exile in the *burg* of Berchtung von Meran, a *burg* which I have elsewhere identified with Clermont in Auvergne, although when the *Oberdeutschen* took the story over from the Franks they shifted the location of the *burg* accordingly.<sup>7</sup> Hugdietrich's wicked treatment of his wife and son inevitably reminded the poet of Ermanric, who treated *his* wife and son even worse, and the next section is therefore quite properly devoted to the tyrannical Gothic king.<sup>8</sup> The general reflections on adversity which follow were originally composed as the concluding section of the poem, I think; in my edition of *Deor* (pp. 15 ff.) I have discussed this matter, as well as the final section in the poem as it now stands.

The pattern of *Deor* forbids the giving of any information as to how the various victims were freed from their evil plight. The story (though not the fact) of Mæðhild's rescue is therefore excluded from the OE poem. But all the other fundamental features of the ballad are either explicit or implicit in the *Deor* passage (with its setting), and we have every right to say that this passage alludes to the same tale as that recorded in the Scandinavian ballad.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> See my papers in *Acta Philologica Scandinavica* IX (1934), 76 ff. and *Studia Germanica tillägnade E. A. Kock* (1934), pp. 192 ff. Norman connects the ðeodric of *Deor* with the Ostrogothic, not the Frankish king of that name, but what is the link between Dietrich von Bern and Geat and Mæðhild? If one insists on the Ostrogoth here, one must also admit the completeness and the abruptness of the shift at this point. It seems more rational to connect ðeodric with the only Theodric in history or story whose psychological association with the preceding passage is easy and natural (or, indeed, possible).

<sup>8</sup> Norman speaks of Ermanric's "inexplicable treachery" (p. 379), but the king's conduct in fact was neither inexplicable nor treacherous; see my discussion in my edition of *Widsith*, pp. 141 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Norman's argument to the contrary hinges upon his theory that Geat is a villain, and this theory, in turn, is based on the presumption that in *Deor* the villains of the various tales are named. But no villains are named in sections 2 and 4, and our section lies between these! Norman's theory *schwebt in der luft*, as the Germans say, and need not detain us longer.

## Notes and News

### "Ariel"

It is proverbially difficult to know "what is in a name"; and the name of Prospero's attendant spirit, though clear enough on the face of it, has turned out, on closer examination, to be full of rather portentous mysteries.

For a long time the "common reader", and indeed the more sophisticated commentator, seem to have rested satisfied with the obvious suggestions of the word itself, and never looked beyond the definition in the First Folio list of *Dramatis Personae*: "an ayrie spirit". Probably more than one remembered, though none apparently before Malone considered it worth while to observe, that the name occurs several times in the Bible, and particularly in that impressive, if somewhat incoherent and obscure, lamentation of the prophet over Jerusalem, "Woe to Ariel, to Ariel, the city where David dwelt" etc. (*Isaiah*, xxix, 1-7). The reference was of course of slender use, as Ariel, the city, could have nothing whatever to do with Ariel, the spirit. It was not certain, moreover, that Isaiah spoke to Shakespeare as he speaks to us: the verse reads, in the Geneva Bible, "Ah, altar, altar of the citie that David dwelt in", and only a marginal note explains, "The Ebrew word Ariel signifieth the Lyon of God, and signifieth the Altar, because the Altar seemed to deuoure the sacrifice that was offered to God, as Ezek. 43.16." So that one could imagine — no very disreputable thing after all — that Shakespeare's ear was caught by the fine fluidity of this almost purely vocalic name, and that not caring overmuch about the origin of it "in Ebrew", he just trusted in what may be called its unavoidable paretymology.

And yet several critics (even before Malone's day, in the first instance) have suspected that this is one of the cases "where more is meant than meets the ear". Thomas Warton — quoted by Malone himself, ed. 1821, p. 3 — had observed that "taken at large, the magical part of the *Tempest* is founded on that sort of philosophy which was practised by John Dee and his associates, and has been called the Rosicrucian. The name Ariel came from the Talmudistick mysteries with which the learned Jews had infected this science." (This in the *History of English Poetry*, vol. iii, 1781, sect. lx). In his *Three Notelets on Shakespeare* (1865) W. J. Thoms pointed out that "Ariel not only answers to the description of the Jewish spirits, Schedim, but ... is the name of one of the seven princes of angels or spirits who preside over waters under Micael the arch-prince." Unfortunately the writer did not give book and chapter for this assertion; he only reprinted from Heywood's *Hierarchy of the Blessed Angels* (which is too late for our purpose) a note on Saint Augustine's belief in spirits who can raise storms and tempests by God's permission. Equally vague was Howard Staunton (in his ed. s.d. 1860? vol. iv, p. 507): "the elementary spirits were divided into six classes by some demonologists, and into four ... by others"; here again a late testimony followed, a passage in Burton's *Anatomy*. Neither Burton nor Saint Augustine, as far as I know, ever mention the name of Ariel.

Credit for following up, or perhaps we should say, for striking anew, this line of investigation, belongs to Monsieur Abel Lefranc. However paradoxical his general thesis about Derby's authorship may be, his wide and "curious" knowledge of the whole period occasionally helps him to discoveries of no trivial interest, even though (as we shall see in the present instance) his obsession prevents him both from exploiting his advantage to the full, and from reaching sober conclusions.

To M. Lefranc's information, then, I want to add; and whilst I am grateful for what he has given us, I am surprised he has not given us more. To his argument, I am afraid that even my little more is fatal.

His book (*Sous le Masque de Shakespeare*, 1919, ii, p. 234) had but little to offer on this score — a mere suggestion that Ariel was "tout simplement", with the slight change of the initial letter, the well-known Uriel,<sup>1</sup> the angel who contributes so much to the revelations of the apocryphal *Fourth Book of Ezra*. And thereby (in M. Lefranc's opinion) hangs a tale, as Uriel was the name of John Dee's favourite angel, and Dee was a trusted friend of William, the Sixth Earl of Derby ....

The short article contributed in 1921 to the *Mélanges* published for the *Cinquantenaire de l'Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes* (Paris, Champion, p. 347-356) had something much more definite to say — and as such, no doubt, it has been admitted by Sir Edmund K. Chambers in the bibliographical list which heralds his own study of the *Tempest* (*William Shakespeare, a Survey*, 1930, i, p. 491). Here M. Lefranc relegated to a demure note his former equation Ariel=Uriel; but by way of ample compensation, he could bring forward — apparently suggested by an American correspondent (p. 349, n.) — a passage in John Trithemius, or Trithem, the master of "natural magic" (died 1516) whose name figures fairly large in any history of the black arts. The book in which the passage occurs, *Steganographia, hoc est Ars per occultam scripturam animi sui voluntatem absentibus aperiendi certe*, must have circulated a good deal in manuscript, at least among a certain kind of readers, before it was published at Frankfort in 1606. But even the later date, M. Lefranc believes, will do: "le poète," he says in his somewhat over-confident vein, "alors épris d'une vive curiosité à l'égard des sciences occultes, sur les suggestions probables de John Dee, fut amené à le consulter"; and this book it is "qui a fourni au poète le nom et le rôle de transmission et d'exécution de l'esprit d'Ariel"; for in this book is found a remarkably full catalogue of the angels who are supposed to carry the influences of the planets; and lo! one of these angels hight Ariel: he is, together with Raphael and Amael, one of the three "spiritus subjecti" who under Zachariel minister to the will or whim of Jupiter. And thereby (of course, in M. Lefranc's opinion) hangs another tale — or the same old tale — as Ferdinando Stanley, "Jove's Eagle-born Ganimed" according to Thomas Nashe, cherished the notion that he was a lucky "Jovialist" — another reason to think that the poet aforesaid was Ferdinando's brother, William, the Sixth Earl of Derby ....

---

<sup>1</sup> Students of Milton and Blake will be particularly interested in Uriel; they will find a great wealth of information, archaeological and other, in Paul Perdrizet, *Uriel*, Prague, 1928. I owe a good deal to the learning of M. Perdrizet, for the notes at the end of this article.



Here it is that one is tempted to add to M. Lefranc's account the little bit of supplementary evidence, which cuts the ground from under his feet.

It was not necessary for "the poet" to wait until the publication in 1606, in far-away Frankfort, of Trithemius' *Steganographia*, to come across an instance of this angelic transmogrification of Ariel.<sup>2</sup> A much better known writer than Trithemius, viz. Cornelius Agrippa, in a much better known book than the *Steganographia*, viz. his *De occulta philosophia*, the editions of which since the original Paris or Antwerp editions of 1531 are too abundant to be enumerated here, had already ranked Ariel, with three others (Seraph, Cherub, and Tharsis), among the "quatuor praecepti elementorum" (Liber II, cap. vii).

One must confess that in the long series of four-fold real or mythical beings which burden this page of Agrippa, Ariel does not seem to correspond technically to the air, but rather to the earth. No definite connexion, however, is asserted by the author — perhaps no more definite connexion could be claimed by any one, than can be claimed between Ariel and Uriel (here one of the "angeli praesidentes cardinibus coeli"), or "Lucas" the Evangelist, or "Luna & Stellae fixae", or Autumn, or the stones, or the reptiles, or the bones, or indeed a host of bewilderingly diverse things, animate and inanimate, all put down, as well as Ariel, in the fourth column of this "scala quaternarii". In fact, it is not clear that any strict correspondence is meant between the first, second, third or fourth respective occupants of the various degrees of this ladder: whereas the table, for instance, reads

4 Elementa:	Ignis.	Aer.	Aqua.	Terra.
4 Qualitates:	Calidum.	Humidum.	Frigidum.	Siccum.

(which seems, strangely enough, to attribute "humidity" to the air, and "coldness" to the water) the text of the chapter itself changes the order of the four "qualities" and reads, no less strangely, "frigidum, calidum, siccum, humidum".

But let the details of this "Tetractys" run mad be as confusing as they seem to have been for Agrippa himself, there was of course no need for Shakespeare to grapple with them. Any one at all versed in the "sweet magic" which had "ravished" Dr. Faustus could have told the poet about the four angels of the elements in the gospel according to Master Cornelius Agrippa of Nettesheim. That Agrippa was an extremely popular figure throughout the Renaissance period in England will hardly be denied. The references in Marlowe's play (Act I, sc. i, line 118 in F. S. Boas' ed. 1932), as well as in Gabriel Harvey's *Letters* (ed. Grosart, i, p. 127), the anecdotes in Nashe's works (cf. index, ed. R. B. McKerrow), — "the greater part of Nashe's apparent learning", says Dr. McKerrow (vol. v, p. 135), "is transferred wholesale from Agrippa's work", and Nashe was obviously interested in Agrippa's magical prowesses quite as much as in his flouting of the traditional sciences — the witness borne by Barnabe Rich to the

<sup>2</sup> In the later editions of the Pitt Press Series, by A. W. Verity (e.g. 1934, p. xlviii), M. Lefranc's discovery is mentioned, the editor adding, "The Abbot also introduces the name Ariel in another magic book called *Polygraphia* of which there was a French translation 1561 often reprinted". But I have failed to trace the passage in either the *Polygraphia* or its French translation; it is not, really, a "magic book," but rather another system of esoteric script.

wide popularity of this *De Vanitate Scientiarum* (*Alarm to England*, 1578), the borrowings made by Stephen Bateman for his ed. of *Bartholome his booke de proprietatibus rerum* (lib. XI, cap. v, s.f. "Of the four elements, and their qualities and mixtures together, forth of Henrie C. Agrippa"), the fact that several of Agrippa's less obnoxious writings were "englished" in the sixteenth century (cf. STC), and the fact that when in 1651 even the three books on occult philosophy were translated, Henry Vaughan's brother wrote a fervent encomium of them,<sup>3</sup> are all perhaps that we need call to mind to understand the situation.

It is somewhat strange that M. Lefranc, who surely knows all about Agrippa's work and fame,<sup>4</sup> should thus have passed by this instance of the use of "Ariel" in what was probably the most famous of the "magic books" of the time. The name assuredly was a handy one to conjure with; but I submit that Agrippa, as he was the more familiar wizard of the two, also worked the better, the more sensible spell: surely, if we must suppose some "occult" notion at the back of the dear name in *The Tempest*, it is more natural to remember the prefect of one of the elements than the mere substitute of the prefect of Jupiter.

But must we suppose anything of the kind? Even those who are convinced — more thoroughly convinced perhaps than M. Lefranc himself was — of the antiquity of the name,<sup>5</sup> may well go on doubting that its adoption by Shakespeare was due to familiarity with the *De Occulta Philosophia*. Many intermediaries could be thought of — whether a more accessible book in the vernacular, or some person in high or low circles who, like Sir Edward

<sup>3</sup> Henry Vaughan himself (as my friend R. Galland kindly points out to me) had at least dipped into Agrippa for his proofs of the Resurrection as derived from nature (cf. ed. L. C. Martin, i. p. 68).

<sup>4</sup> He has published an excellent paper on *Rabelais et Cornelius Agrippa* for the *Mélanges Emile Picot* (Paris, 1913, vol. ii). Agrippa, who died in Grenoble in 1535, was at least as famous in France as in England (cf. P. Villey, *Les sources des Essais de Montaigne*; J. Bodin, *Daemonomania*, I. ch. iii).

<sup>5</sup> This is obviously a large question into which we do not claim to have looked otherwise than in a fearful and cursory manner.

That Agrippa could hardly be the first or the only writer who considered Ariel as a spirit of the elements is clear: the late Sir Israel Gollancz (in the first "Temple" edition) may have had another authority for his assurance that "the name Ariel, of Hebraistic origin, ... was derived from some such treatise as Heywood's *Hierarchy of the Blessed Angels*"; Jos. Schmitz, in the recent *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, vol. i, 1930, asserts in the same way, though again without reference, "In der Kabbala und im Volksglauben, Wasser- bzw. Luftgeist"; Moïse Schwab, in his *Vocabulaire de l'Angéologie d'après les manuscrits hébreux de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris, 1897, p. 73, was more definite: "Ari El, lion de Dieu. Nom de l'esprit de la terre à la 3ème teoufah; cf. S. Raziel, f. 6a; ou nom de l'ange du premier jour de la semaine: ibid. f. 41b. C'est un desservant d'Orfaniel au Ier trône céleste: ibid. f. 34b. Ce nom figure écrit et sculpté dans l'un des médaillons d'une pierre calcaire qui a dû servir pour couler des patènes, trouvée près de Gémigny (Loiret) en janvier 1884, voir Ed. Le Blant, *Nouv. Recueil des inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule antérieures au VIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*."

The last quotation is enough to suggest that the avocations of Ariel have been indeed multifarious; and more recent research amply confirms this view: Dom H. Leclercq has printed in the *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne*, 1913 (s.v. "conjuración") a conjuring formula of the eighth century, in which Ariel is invoked together with Michael, Gabriel, Racoel, and others; E. Peterson, in his learned article on "Engel- und Dämonennamen" (*Rhein. Museum*, 1926), has observed that Ariel appears as an angel of the snow in Syria, an angel of the wind in Asia Minor, though he becomes a punishing angel in the *Pistis Sophia*, and the warder of the second gate of Heaven in the *Visio Adamani*.

But we must refrain from looking into this "dark backward and abysm of time".

Dyer, (cf. his recent life by Mr. Ralph M. Sargent, Oxford, 1935) was fond of dabbling in magic. However that may be, the eighteenth century notion that "Ariel" takes us back to the old occultist tradition, even if we cannot trace Shakespeare's direct source with assurance, has undoubtedly more foundation than was hitherto suspected.

Strasbourg.

A. KOSZUL.

## Notes on Synchronic Grammar

### (ii) The Phono-semantic Parallel

While the relation of the phonic to the semantic categories of language forms the basis of the modern theory of the phoneme as functional element, the parallelism of these fundamental planes of language has received comparatively little discussion. The following remarks take as starting-point the principles enunciated by A. Sechehaye<sup>1</sup> at the second international congress of linguists. The basis of comparison appears to this scholar to be furnished by the proportion: "Le phonème acoustique est au phonème articulé comme le signifiant est au signifié." "Signifié" is fixed in the (doubtless Saussurian) sense of *Bedeutung*<sup>2</sup> (as opposed to *Meinung*) by the explanatory statement that the categories in question are considered only in so far as they belong to "la langue"; similarly the "phonème articulé" is an "idée type"; the sound as belonging to "la parole" is by nature excluded from the scheme.<sup>3</sup> But the oppositions established give immediate rise to certain doubts, few of which are answered in the paragraphs which follow Sechehaye's first statement of principle; for where the absence of symmetry is noticed, it is taken to inhere in the nature of the planes opposed, rather than in the arbitrary selection of the categories on the two levels. The following are a few of the more obvious points of asymmetry:

(i) The association of "image motrice" and "image acoustique" is not arbitrary, as that of "signifiant" and "signifié".<sup>4</sup>

(ii) The "image motrice" is a pre-condition exclusively for the production of speech; whereas for its understanding both "signifiant" and "signifié" must be "given".

<sup>1</sup> *Actes du Deuxième Congrès International de Linguistes*, Maisonneuve 1933, pp. 118-120.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. E. Winkler, *Sprachtheoretische Studien* (Berliner Beiträge z. Rom. Phil., III, 220 ff. and Husserl, *Logische Untersuchungen* II/i, p. 49 ff. (Bedeutung: gegenständliche Beziehung). A popular account in Gardiner's recent book (meaning: thing meant), where the relations to other categories remain untreated; (*The Theory of Speech and Language*, Oxford 1932, pp. 29-33).

Although de Saussure is rightly accused by Gardiner of ignoring this opposition, this fact is in part excused by the former's occupation with "language"; and in any case not more objectionable than that Gardiner, in his predominant interest for "speech," should ignore de Saussure's fundamental distinction, within the boundaries of "la langue", of *valeur* and *signification*.

<sup>3</sup> In view of this we use the terms employed in the following lines of the report, "image motrice" resp. "image acoustique."

<sup>4</sup> For the relation of these terms to the "signe" which is their composition cf. Saussure, *Cours*, p. 98 ff.



(iii) Partly for these reasons the "image motrice" is not regarded by de Saussure as an integral part of "la langue"; which would have been absurd in the case of the two ideas opposed.

(iv) The "signifiant" is not situated purely on the semantic plane, but may be described in terms of its phonological composition; whereas the idea opposed, the "image acoustique" (as contrasted with the phoneme as functional element) is as entirely devoid of relations with the semantic side of language as the "image motrice".

The *signifiant* (form regarded as bearer of meaning) has its real counterpart on the phonic plane in the phoneme as differential element (functional phoneme). Just as the latter is distinguished from the other categories of its series (phoneme as acoustic idea, etc.) by virtue of functioning in the system of *signifiants*, so the former is distinguished from the purely semantic categories of meaning and value by the ability to be analysed — on one side — in terms of members of the phoneme-system.<sup>5</sup> Just as the functional phoneme is regarded apart from the actual functions it may consistently clothe in particular categories (morphoneme), so only the fact of formal distinction, not the actual phoneme-combination actually composing the *signifiant*, is relevant to its status. The grammatical and lexicographical systems (systems of values), systems of *signifiants* on the basis of meaning (*signifié*), correspond to the systems of phonemes as points of a scheme of oppositions, systems of functional phonemes arranged on the basis of the acoustic ideas with which they are associated. In so far however as we regard the phonemes resp. values in terms of their systematic functions resp. analysis upon the opposed level, we speak of morphoneme- resp. analogical system. Hence the scheme:

Language				Speech
Phonic pl.	Oppositional ph.	Functional ph.	Acoustic idea	sound
Semantic „	Value (valeur)	Signifiant	Signifié (Bedeutung)	reference (Meinung)

As considered here, the various levels of the semantic plane (word, morpheme) are not related to one another as their smallest unit (the morpheme) is to the phoneme. The relations of the smaller to the next superior units are naturally of quite a different nature. And in particular when Sechehayé cites as further point of comparison the fact that both phoneme and sign are "faits ... pour être combinés" the absence of parallelism only becomes more striking, for the combinations of phonemes normally belong to language in the most narrow sense, those of words are

<sup>5</sup> The earlier tendency of the Prague school to regard the class of functional phonemes as exactly covered by, if not identical with, the class of acoustic ideas or images, has its pendant in the thesis of L. Hjelmslev's *Principes de Grammaire Générale* (Copenhagen 1928), who would identify, in a given language, formal and semantic classes (i.e. classes of *signifié*).

<sup>6</sup> For V. Brøndal (*Morfologi og Syntax*, Copenhagen 1930) syntax belongs necessarily to "Tale", as morphology to "Sprog". It seems however that Brøndal has in view speech as the succession of linguistic elements in time rather than as the application of language and the inarbitrary features incidental to its realisation, the more usual sense and that envisaged here.

seldom completely arbitrary and except in the rare cases where the word-order has been grammaticalised<sup>6</sup> belong to speech.

The two sets of categories considered do not stand to each other in the relation of "smaller" and "larger" or of "composing" and "composed", except in the case of the second series, and here only incidentally, and not invariably; cf. the case where absence of phoneme represents a morpheme. The relations are possibly further set in relief by their application to change in language. Phonetic variants acquire the status of (functional) phonemes only after, through "unsympathetic" tradition, sounds originally identified by the same acoustic idea(s)<sup>7</sup> are interpreted as distinct through the inability of the hearer to feel them as product of the same intention. Similarly referential variants acquire the status of independent *signifiants* only when the linguistically unsympathetic position of the hearer prevents recognition of the identity of meaning beneath the variety of references or "things meant". (Cf. the article of Manu Leumann: I.F. XLV, 105: *Zum Mechanismus des Bedeutungswandels*.<sup>8</sup>)

But they do not even then necessarily acquire this status; the phonetic variants may survive as systematic morphonemes, which in practice can seldom be distinguished from the former.<sup>9</sup> A difference of acoustic idea must also be allowed where aphonematic variants may accidentally be opposed in a pair of words one of which allows morphematic analysis (type Ger. Ku:x'n: Ku:ç'n, cf. Vachek, *Zur Phonologischen Interpretation der Diphthonge*, p. 140).<sup>10</sup> A certain feeling for variety of meaning, similarly, does not necessarily impair the unity of the morpheme resp. word; rather the *signifié* is felt in this case as "linear" rather than "punctual".

Older phonetic variations, where their phonematic resolution does not result in the opposition within the phoneme-scheme of the earlier variants, still normally leave the mark of the original relation in the series of morphonemes; which is paralleled by the imprint on the analogical system of earlier variations of reference which never fully enter the scheme of value-oppositions; cases such as the identity of 1st. persons Sing. Pres. Subj.

<sup>7</sup> Acoustic "idea" is to be preferred to "image"; the linguistic fact is constituted rather by the recognition than by the representation of the type. Just as the meaning of a word may be quite "ohne Anschauung gedacht".

<sup>8</sup> As "Bedeutungswandel [wird] vollzogen durch etymologisch falsche, sachlich immerhin angemessene Interpretation", so the alteration of acoustic units is made possible by false interpretation of correctly observed phonetic variations.

<sup>9</sup> As with the *aufgehobene Gegensätze* of the phoneme-system, which may still retain grammatical reality through the analogy of related forms where the phonetic conditions of phoneme-coalescence are absent, so a morpheme-opposition may still remain in principle where non-grammatical (rhythmical, etc.) conditions prevent its realisation. Thus the positional opposition of direct and indirect object is usually given up in the type with noun and pronoun, because of the *Gesetz der wachsenden Glieder* which renders "(they) gave his father it" objectionable. This type has nevertheless been assumed (*Eng. Sts.* XIX, 22 footnote 9) as the correspondent of the passive conversion *His father was given it* on the analogy of the nouns where only the former member can become subject. Similarly the occasional reversion of the normal order of two nouns does not necessarily disprove the grammatical validity of this order, where the motives can be regarded as rhythmical.

<sup>10</sup> An interesting instance of a sound with no functional validity yet influencing the morphological system, and thus certainly of acoustic significance, occurs in Armenian, where the vowel ə, exclusively used to facilitate the pronunciation of consonant-groups, still counts as syllable-forming for the morphological system, where e.g. *k(ə)lux* has the plural in -ner peculiar to polysyllables (Meillet, *Arménien Classique*<sup>2</sup> (1936), p. 53).

and future in the 3rd. and 4th. conj. of Latin (if the usual explanation is valid), where the use of "subjunctive for future" at first no more than realising a "subjunctive intention" in situations to which, referentially, the future could be regarded as applicable, were interpreted as "expressing" formally the idea of the future paradigm and formally enrolled in this.

The parallelism here briefly outlined is not affected by the interesting criticisms of Twaddell<sup>11</sup> on the orthodox principles of the Prague School, as long as the terms we regard as opposed can in each case be regarded as in an equal degree fictitious or real; while the subjective terminology here preferred provides a more ready shorthand for the treatment of such questions than is available for the methodical behaviourist. For the psychologist morpheme- resp. word-meaning must always remain of the nature of a fiction, as much as the acoustic image; it is observable only through the multiplicity of references,<sup>12</sup> and even for the linguist who is willing to operate with "speech-feeling" is still only definable in terms of the relations which exist between units of its kind within the language (value-relation); this does not render the distinction of value and meaning (as stressed by de Saussure) any less fundamental.<sup>13</sup>

The inaccessibility<sup>14</sup> to definition of acoustic idea and meaning, where their presence in a system does not render their definition possible in terms of this, (as is the case with a limited number of principally consonantal phonemes in most languages which are irreferable to any series, but on the semantic plane with the greater part of the vocabulary (stem-morphemes) and formative elements) is one point of a parallelism which is complete. The two terms represent the "pure ideas" of the levels to which they respectively belong, abstraction made of the linguistic system, which presupposes them. Whereas the resemblance of *image motrice* and meaning, that both are the result of an interpretation, is apparent in other linguistic categories, is indeed characteristic of the whole linguistic system, and can imply no parallel, and least when set against the pair: acoustic image and *signifiant*, which owe all resemblance to the fact that the latter may be regarded as the composition of units of the former to a higher unit, a relation which very obviously does not pertain between meaning and motorial image.

Oxford.

C. E. BAZELL.

<sup>11</sup> *On Defining the Phoneme*, Language Monographs XVI, 1935.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Hans Lipps, *Untersuchungen zur Phänomenologie der Erkenntnis*, Vol. I, 29 ff.

<sup>13</sup> The apparent identification of *valeur* and *signifié* in Ch. Bally's *Le Langage et la Vie* (2d. ed. 1935, cf. p. 120) is surprising.

<sup>14</sup> This is quite independent of the practical difficulty, stressed by W. F. Twaddell, of adequately describing acoustic impressions. Here only the theoretical impossibility of defining an intention (an acoustic, semantic, or indeed of articulation) except in terms of relation to other units on the same level, is in consideration. The qualities which relate the system remain themselves by nature indescribable; and our conventional terminology must be taken from the sphere of realisation.



## Sir Gawain and Medieval Football

Although in most known allusions to football in Middle-English literature the game is specifically mentioned, there are one or two instances where no designation occurs but where the action described leaves no doubt in the reader's mind as to what game is in question.<sup>1</sup> Such for example is the comparison in Chaucer's *Knight's Tale* (C. T., A 2597 ff.) where the memorable combat between the supporters of Palamon and Arcite is on:

Ther stomblen steedes stronge and doun gooth al;  
He rolleth under foot as dooth a bal.<sup>2</sup>

An additional case occurs in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, v. 427-28:

De fayre hede fro þe halce hit to þe erpe,  
Dat fele hit foyned wyth her fete, þere hit forth roled.<sup>3</sup>

There can be no doubt that the poet wishes to convey the impression that many members of Arthur's court played football with the Green Knight's head. The thought is gruesome if not directly phantastic, yet finds an apparent counterpart in real life. In 1321 a certain John de Boddeworth, servant of the abbot of the monastery of the Vale Royal of Cheshire was murdered by the brothers Oldynton at Darnhall (Ch); as a sequel, as gruesome if not more so than the *Gawain*-episode, it is stated that the murderers subsequently played football with the victim's head ('*ad modum pilae cum pedibus suis conculcaverunt*').<sup>4</sup>

From later literature at least three other examples of football-play with a human head are known. In a Gothic play, *The Castle Spectre*, by M. G. Lewis, acted at Drury Lane on December 14, 1797, a servant is reporting to the visiting son of a former employer on the state of affairs at Castle Spectre. Among other things he informs him that 'Lord Hildebrand, who was condemned for treason some sixty years ago, may be seen in the Great Hall, regularly at midnight, playing at foot-ball with his own head.'<sup>5</sup> Similarly during a trial (ca. 1790) for the suppression of Shrove Tuesday football at Kingston-upon-Thames the tradition was given in evidence at Croydon (Sr) before Baron Hotham that the game in question commemorated a victory over the Danes and that, 'the Captain of the Danish forces having been slain, and his head kicked about by the people in derision, the custom of kicking a Foot Ball about on the anniversary of that day has been observed ever since.'<sup>6</sup> The indicted persons were acquitted on the ground of having only observed an immemorial custom. And finally, be it noted, Francesco de' Medici in John Webster's *The White Devil* (1612) says of his enemy Brachiano (Act IV, Sc. 1, vv. 134-35):

<sup>1</sup> Magoun, 'Football in Medieval England,' *American Historical Review*, XXXV (1929), 33-45.

<sup>2</sup> *Idem*, p. 38.

<sup>3</sup> First noted as a reference to football in *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, XIII (1931), 41, n. 6.

<sup>4</sup> George Ormerod, *The History of the County Palatine and City of Chester* (rev. ed., T. Helsby, London, 1882), II, 162, col. 1, item xxxii; from British Museum Ms. Harley 2064. 14 E.

<sup>5</sup> *Op cit.*, (London, 1798), Act II, sc. i, p. 23.

<sup>6</sup> W. D. Biden, *The History and Antiquities of the Ancient and Royal Town of Kingston-upon-Thames* (Kingston, 1853), pp. 58-59, note b. See further *Harvard Studies and Notes*, *cit. supra*, p. 21.

Like the wild Irish, I'll nere thinke the dead,  
Till I can play at footeball with thy head.

Oddly enough, and perhaps quite unknown to Webster, the Francesco of real life was an enthusiastic player of Florentine *calcio* ('football') in his youth.<sup>7</sup>

It would be interesting to know if further instances of this curious football tradition are known in English literature.

Harvard University,  
Cambridge, Mass., USA.

FRANCIS P. MAGOUN, JR.

### A Survival of it is = there is

The expression *it is*, familiar to students of Old and Middle English as used in a sentence like "It is somebody at the door" instead of "There is somebody," etc., still survives among negroes and less educated whites of the Southern section of the United States. A note just received from a negro wash-woman asking us if we had failed to put the customary amount of money with the wash, began: "Mrs \* \* \* it was'n't but one Dollar in the Basket Monday morning."<sup>1</sup> I had once heard a white store-clerk say, "It's some wool in that box," and I had often heard negro cooks say, "It's only one grapefruit left" or "It's no more coffee." But I had not before had written evidence of the expression.

University of Virginia,  
Charlottesville Va.

ATCHESON L. HENCH.

### R. E. Zachrisson †

The sudden death of Professor R. E. Zachrisson will be widely deplored in Anglistic circles. To those who knew him more intimately the message probably did not come altogether as a surprise, for he had not been strong in health for some years, and in June last he had to go to hospital owing to heart trouble. But he seemed to have made a good recovery, and he had gone to a summer resort (Ronneby) for the vacation, when death suddenly overtook him on July 28. He was buried at Karlskrona on August 2.

Robert Eugen Zachrisson, as he was called by his full name, was born at Karlskrona in the province of Blekinge on Jan. 15, 1880. His father was a business man of that town. He matriculated at Lund University in 1900 and got his degree of Doctor of Philosophy in 1909. He became

<sup>7</sup> To whom, for example, Giovanni de' Bardi dedicated his *Discorso sopra del giuoco del calcio fiorentino* (Florence, 1580). See further *passim* Alfredo Lensi, *Il Gioco del calcio fiorentino* (Florence, 1931).

<sup>1</sup> The punctuation and the capitalization are as in the note.

a docent in English philology at Lund in 1909, but temporarily threw up his academic career already in the following year, when he was appointed lecturer in English and German at the State training-school for women teachers (Högre Lärarinnese seminariet) at Stockholm. He returned to academic work in 1921, however, when he was appointed Professor of the English Language at Uppsala University, a post he held till his death.

My earliest memories of Zachrisson date as far back as the year 1906, when he joined my English seminar at Lund. It was in the course of the work at the seminar that the subject cropped up on which he wrote his doctor's dissertation. When we were dealing with the extract from Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle in Kluge's *Mittelenglisches Lesebuch*, it struck me that several place-name forms there seemed to show traces of Norman influence, and I suggested that he should take up for investigation Anglo-Norman influence on English place-names generally. Something had been done in this field earlier, especially by Skeat and Morsbach, but a full treatment had never been attempted. The book (*Anglo-Norman Influence on English Place-names*, 1909) is too well known for an account of it to be needed here. It was a notable achievement, especially if it is taken into consideration that it was its author's first work. — Some smaller contributions to place-name study followed in the next few years, (e.g. *Latin Influence on English Place-nomenclature*, 1910), but soon Zachrisson turned to other fields.

In 1913 he published his *Pronunciation of English Vowels 1400—1700*, in which he took up for treatment Early Modern English sound-history, a branch of study then much in vogue. Also this book attracted much attention, and some scholars perhaps look upon it as his most important contribution to English philology. To this group of works belongs, besides some shorter articles, *The English Pronunciation at Shakespeare's Time as taught by William Bullokar*, published in 1927, but ready in the main as early as 1913. It contains a full study of Bullokar's important transcriptions with word-lists.

After his appointment as professor, Zachrisson returned to place-names, and in this later work chiefly devoted himself to place-name etymology. He did not publish any larger work, but instead a number of articles or shorter books, the most important being *English Place-Names and River-Names containing the Primitive Germanic Roots \*vis, \*vask* (1926) and *Romans Kelts and Saxons* (1927). For some years, however, he gave his chief interest to Anglic, his system of a simplified English spelling, which he advocated with much spirit and energy. His aim was not simply to help bring about a simpler spelling, but ultimately to make English more fitted to become an international language. He published many pamphlets advocating the system, especially *Anglic, An International Language* (1932), and *An English Pronouncing Dictionary and Spelling-list in Anglic* (1933).

In the last few years of his life, Zachrisson's interest in Anglic seemed to decrease, and he devoted the time still allotted to him mainly to place-names. He had planned a comprehensive work on English place-names, but he only found time to publish some preparatory studies for it, especially *English Place-Name Puzzles* (1933), *English Place-Names in the Light of the Terminal Theory* (1934) and *Studies on the -ing Suffix in Old English Place-Names* (1936—7).



Zachrisson was warmly interested in the practical teaching of languages. He wrote a handbook on English styles (*Engelska stilarter*, 1919), an English grammar for schools (*Engelsk grammatik*, 1933), and he edited several annotated modern texts for use in Swedish schools. He also took an active part in the discussion of questions of teaching method and school reform in Sweden. On the other hand, subjects of a literary or critical nature were not foreign to him, as shown by his book *Thomas Hardy* (1928) and other contributions.

Zachrisson founded the periodical *Studia Neophilologica* in 1928 and edited it till his death.

The preceding list of publications is by no means exhaustive, but I believe it is representative and contains all the most important of Zachrisson's works. A full list would far exceed the space that could be allotted to this memoir. The list will give a fairly good idea of the wide range of Zachrisson's interests and studies. He was an indefatigable worker, active till the end. His last published work appeared after his death.

Lund.

EILERT EK WALL.

**English Studies at Groningen.** Dr. R. W. Zandvoort, editor of *English Studies* and *privaat-docent* at the University of Leiden, has been appointed Professor of English at the University of Groningen.

The Editor's address will remain unchanged until further notice.

**Forthcoming Contributions.** The December number will include an article by Prof. Dr. Max Wildi, of St. Gall, Switzerland, on *The Birth of Expressionism in the Work of D. H. Lawrence*; also Dr. Frederick T. Wood's annual survey of recent publications in the field of Criticism and Biography.

## Reviews

*Widsith.* Edited by KEMP MALONE. (Methuen's Old English Library. General editors A. H. Smith, Ph. D., and F. Norman, M.A.) XIII + 202 pp. London: Methuen, 1936. 10s. 6d.

It might seem indeed a bold undertaking to produce a new edition of *Widsith* after R. W. Chambers' masterly *Study* of 1912. Yet the very fact that a new edition of this difficult poem was needed, is a sign that the interest in Old English heroic poetry is as vivid now as it was at the beginning of our century. And if we consult the impressive Bibliography of the present edition (pp. 98-113), which is fittingly dedicated to

Chambers, we find nearly as many entries of Widsithiana since 1912 as before that date. By far the most productive contributor was Professor Kemp Malone himself, whose keen and searching mind seems to have been urged to its boldest flights by the very difficulties of this thorny text. The present edition is most welcome as it combines the editor's previous miscellanea into an imposing and extremely logical organism. The Introduction discusses matters of composition, language and date; the Text is based on the editor's own transcript from the Exeter Book and contains full notes as to variant readings of successive editors; the Glossary of Proper Names embodies the bulk of the editor's own contributions in the field of primitive Germanic legend and history.

The characteristic feature of the edition is its freshness of tone. The Cartesian *doute méthodique* seems indeed to be the guiding principle of the editor who, with all his profound knowledge of previous Widsithian scholarship, is never unaware of its many shortcomings. Inspired by a remarkable *horror vacui* in the matter of literary problems, and gifted with an unbounded confidence in the knowability of things epic and heroic, our editor sets about examining every problem (and that means, practically, every word) of *Widsith* anew. The result is that the reader feels that he has, in many respects, actually come to closer quarters with the Germanic heroic age, has made, as it were, the personal acquaintance of this gifted Anglo-Saxon scop, but also has been treated to some conjectural lore much beyond the ordinary laws of philological or historical probability.

The conception of the editor as to the composition of the poem may be summarized as follows. Malone distinguishes, in the body of Widsith's speech, three main sections, which he calls 'fits' in accordance with Old English usage (ll. 18-49, 50-111, 112-130). These 'fits' are made up of name lists, here called 'thulas' after the Icelandic. These three main parts roughly coincide with the 'natural' divisions, or 'lays', distinguished by previous scholars, from Müllenhoff down to Holthausen, Chambers and Sievers. They are here found to be embellished by certain 'episodes' outside the thula-pattern (e.g. the Offa and Wulfhere episodes). The second thula contains, in addition, 'five sections, more or less lyrical in character', which the editor styles 'yeds' (from OE *zied*, *zid* 'poem, song'; p. 2). These yeds contain the Guðhere, Aelfwine, Casere, and Ermanric story. The thulas are considered as the oldest sections of the poem, the original three catalogues to be dated about 520, 530 and soon after 565 A.D. respectively. The author of the first thula, whose home was 'the Baltic coast rather than the coast of the North Sea', is conjectured to have been a member of the Danish tribe of the *Wrosnan* (l. 33, and p. 19). The addition of episodes is more particularly the work of the *Widsith* poet, whose skill in composition is given lavish praise. The editor is inclined to accept but eight 'interpolated' lines, viz. 14-17 (Hwala-Alexander passage, on the strength of a very bold hypothesis of a 'first draft' and a copy of the 'final version', p. 5), 82-83 (Old Testament names), 114 ('a metrical gloss'), and 118 (*Wiðmyrgingas*, a doubtful name-form). The date and locality of the OE poem as now preserved are given according to the conservative view: the text, perhaps Mercian in origin (see Brandl, *Grundriss*<sup>2</sup>; Sievers, in 1921, detected a considerable portion of Old-Kentish speech melody, alternating with the Late West Saxon tune of the bulk of the poem), was composed during the earlier part of the age of Bede; i.e. the

latter part of the seventh century, and successively copied by scribes of different dialects.

To illustrate the wealth of information, fresh material, and conjecture contained in the edition, and especially in the Glossary of Proper Names, a few examples may be given. The *Moide* and *Perse* of l. 84 are explained, not as 'Medes' and 'Persians', or further examples of the "zusammengelesene Gelehrsamkeit" (Sievers) of the interpolator of l. 82-83, but as original Germanic geographic or tribal names, viz. 'the inhabitants of Møn, an island of the Danish archipelago' (< prehistoric base *mōh-* [meaning not given] + suffix of appurtenance *-id*), and 'the Franks of Neustria' (< *Parisii*). At the same time, the very pardonable mistake of this confusion is attributed to the interpolator of ll. 82-83 himself (p. 181), who first made the wrong identification of l. 84 and afterwards put his '*Isra-helas*', etc., in accordingly.

The etymology proposed for *Myrgingas*, the Saxon tribe to which Widsith himself belonged, is very suggestive: "the tribal name means 'inhabitants of a watery district' and stands in grade relation to the *Mauringa* of Paulus Diaconus" (p. 177).

In l. 21 the MS reading *Henden* is preserved (modern eds.: *Heoden* = ON *Heðinn*) and etymologized as a Goth. masc. *a*-stem *\*handins*, another grade of *\*hindins* = 'king' (cf. Ammianus Marcellinus: *hendingōs*; p. 15). This explanation is not very convincing.

One of the boldest, though not of the most probable, suggestions of our editor is the theory that in *Dyle* and *Rondingas* (l. 246) is hidden an allusion to Hygelac's defeat [A.D. c. 516] at the hands of *Deodric*, the King of the Franks mentioned in l. 24a. *Dyle* is conceived "as eponym of the *Pilir*, a wellknown Norwegian tribe, the inhabitants of *Belamørk*," whence a contingent was included in Hygelac's army; thus, *Rondingas* means not 'shieldmen', but 'mark-dwellers, men of the border' (pp. 192, 18).

In the category of most ingenious and, to my mind, convincing conjectures I should reckon the hypothetical reading l. 85 *\*Ofdingum* (MS. *Mofdingum*). This might be a dynastic name of the Ostrogoths, derived from *Ovida*, grandfather of Geberich, predecessor of Ermanric (pp. 28 f., 178). It is also a fascinating suggestion that the received (and unknown) name-form l. 112 *Heðca* ought to be emended to *\*Hehca* (original MS. form perhaps *\*hoichca*, from prim. OE *\*Hōhica* < prim. Germ. *\*Hanhikō*) and to be identified with Ermanric's father *\*Hachiulf* (= Jordanes' *Achiulf*), and that *Beadeca* (l. 112) is identical with king *Baduila*, or *Totila*, of the Ostrogoths.

On the other hand, the translation of l. 9a *wraþes wærlogan* as 'hostile to treaties' (*wærlogan* = dat. pl. *-an* < *um*; cp. p. 51) — instead of 'the fell treaty-breaker' (g.sg.) — will find few followers (cp. Holthausen's objection in AB 48 (1937), p. 33-34). And the complicated syntax of l. 5 — *mid Ealhilde* going, not with the immediately preceding *he*, but with the *Hreðcyninges ham* of l. 7 — remains difficult to accept in spite of the arguments on p. 137 and in Anglia 55, 266 f. The evidence of the *Widsith*-text itself seems to me to be strong enough to assume that a confusion between *Ealhild* and *Swanhild* did take place in England (or with the *Widsith* poet) — a confusion certainly not bolder to conjecture than the very plausible assumption (p. 135) of a splitting of the *Eadwine* (ll. 74, 98, 117) of our poem into *Eadwine*, the Langobard *Audoin* (l. 74,



117), and Eadwine, the otherwise unknown father of Ealhhild (l. 98). Notice also the misgivings which Chambers had about the identity of this name-form in its two Widsithian functions (p. 23, 122 of his edition).

To supplement Malone's own 'Addenda et Corrigenda' in MLR 31 (1936) with another bibliographical item: a very suggestive study concerning actual and possible accretions in the Germanic Dula-pattern is G. Baeseke, 'Über germanisch-deutsche Stammtafeln und Königslisten' in GRM 24 (1936), c. 161 f. Baeseke regards ll. 114, 118, 77-78 of *Widsith* as "Störungen von Namenreihen"; on the strength of the *Hwala*-addition (l. 14) he dates *Widsith* in its present form "frühestens 891".

Giessen.

W. FISCHER.

*The Siege of Jerusalem.* Edited from MS. Laud Misc. 656 with Variants from all other Extant MSS. by E. KÖLBING, Ph. D. and MABEL DAY, D. Lit. London, Humphrey Milford, 1932. xxxi + 133 pp. + 1 plate. 15 sh. nett.

Early English Text Society. Original Series, No. 188. 1932 (for 1931).

*The Book of Fayttes of Armes and of Chyualrye.* Translated and printed by William Caxton from the French Original by Christine de Pisan. Edited by A. T. P. BYLES, M.A. London, Humphrey Milford, 1932. lvii + 315 pp. + 3 plates. 21 sh. nett.

Early English Text Society. Original Series, No. 189. 1932.

*An Anonymous Short English Metrical Chronicle.* Edited from the MSS. with Introduction and Glossary by EWALD ZETTL, Ph. D. London, Humphrey Milford, 1935. cxxxvi + 163 pp. 20 sh. nett.

Early English Text Society. Original Series, No. 196. 1935 (for 1934).

*Firumbras and Otuel and Roland.* Edited from MS. Brit. Mus. Addit. 37492. By MARY ISABELLE O'SULLIVAN, Ph. D., Professor of English in Rosemont College, Pennsylvania. London, Humphrey Milford, 1935. lxxxviii + 191 pp. + 1 plate. 18 sh. nett.

Early English Text Society, Original Series, No. 198. 1935 (for 1934).

The present edition of the *Siege of Jerusalem* was begun by the late Professor E. Kölbing, and the text with the variant readings was set up as early as 1898, when the first 32 pages were printed off. It has now been completed by Dr. Mabel Day, who has revised the text and provided an Introduction, Notes, and a Glossary. It is curious how many mistakes the text printed in 1898 contains; the list of corrections to lines 1-580 fills four pages.

Though the *Siege* was edited in 1891 by Steffler, a fact I do not find

mentioned in the Introduction, we owe Dr. Day a debt of gratitude for having brought to a close the work left unfinished by Kölbing, and for the very important Introduction, Notes, and Glossary, which are her own work altogether. The text has considerable literary value, and it offers a good deal of interest linguistically. It also has the advantage of being pretty accurately dated. The poem shows obvious reminiscences from certain other romances, especially *Patience* and the *Troy Book*. The description of the storm ll. 53-70 shows remarkable similarity to famous passages in the said poems. Now the *Troy Book* has a reference to *Troilus*, which seems to mean Chaucer's *Troilus*. The latter was written c. 1382-5. On the other hand, the author of *Titus and Vespasian* seems to have known and used the *Siege*, and the earliest MS. of that text (Laud Misc. 622) dates from c. 1400. The date of the *Siege* must then be the last decade of the 14th century. Unfortunately it is far more difficult to say where the poem was written. Dr. Day concludes from certain metrical peculiarities that it was written originally in a Midland dialect of a more northerly type than *Piers Plowman* or even the *Gawain* group, a little south of the *Troy Book*, and approaching most nearly to *Morte Arthure*. The evidence is not very satisfactory, and all that can be said is that the original poem belonged to the north-west Midland. None of the existing MSS. seem to preserve the original dialect.

In the Introduction special interest attaches to the parts dealing with the Growth of the Legend (iii), the Sources (iv), the Literary Connections (v-viii). The material was drawn chiefly from the *Vindicta Salvatoris*, Higden's *Polychronicon*, and the *Legenda Aurea*. Reprints of the parts of the first-mentioned two texts laid under contribution are given in App. II and III. Seven MSS. of the *Siege* are preserved, one of which lacks the first 961 lines. MS. Bodl. 1059 (Laud Misc. 656) is the earliest and best, and it is made the basis of the edition. The pedigree of the MSS. on p. x seems well founded. The metre is alliterative verse, and there seems to have been the same division into quatrains as that found in *Patience* and other poems.

Chapter ii is devoted to the dialect. I notice here that *luther*, *suth* 'since' are not good examples of OE *y*. *Doil*, *deil* can hardly be called Northern spellings, as the source is Fr. *deuil*. *Dornen* l. 17 is clearly an adjective 'of thorns', not a genitive plural of *þorn*. Also *waspen(e)* ll. 32, 34 is a doubtful instance of a gen. plur. in *-ene*. It occurs in the combination *waspen(e) bee* 'wasp'. *Waspen* seems more likely to be an adjective too. On p. xxix the reference to *Patience* is given wrongly as 893-6 instead of 137-152.

The following remarks may be made on the text. In l. 64 the reading *keuereþ the yþes* 'covers the waves' is not very satisfactory. No other MS. has this reading. Perhaps *keuereþ* should be corrected to *kerueþ* 'cuts'. — 139. The alliteration suggests *chaytifēs* instead of *caytifēs*. — 181. The metre seems to demand the full form *louerd* for *lord*. — 278. *Schewyng of scharpe stele*, as in MSS. A E C, is metrically better than the form given. — 372. *Scorned* spoils the alliteration. E's reading *y-schaue* suggests an original *schoren* 'shorn, shaven'. — 394. *Wlonfulle* is a doubtful reading. A's *wankille*, coupled with *wantoun* in D A C, suggests *wonkulle* as the right reading. *Wankle world* is a common combination. — 670. *Playande picche* does not sound right. I suggest *popeland*, from

*popple* 'to bubble up, boil'. The word is found in *Patience*, though not used of the bubbling of a boiling liquid. *Popelande* easily accounts for *boyland* in U, *boylyng* in DC.

A few remarks may be made on the Notes.

L. 32. *Biker* 'bee-hive', if correct, is here for the first time evidenced in English. But the meaning is 'swarm' rather than 'hive', and perhaps *bike* is the correct form. — 163. I am not sure there are really two words *prive*, one meaning 'private, secret', the other 'open, manifest'. *Privy* often means 'intimate, familiar', and from that a meaning 'familiarily known' or the like may well have developed. — 207. I am not convinced that the correction of *who* to *and* in the side-note is correct. Peter would know about the vernicle before Vespasian mentioned it. — 261. *and non nyztes reste* surely means simply 'and no night's rest'. The *noon* in the passage from *God's Complaint* quoted means 'none', not 'no'. — 344. The statement that "Orm's frequent use of this word (sc. *come* noun), in all cases, at the line end ... points to its derivation from OE. \**cōme*" is not very clear. See on the word Björkman, *Loan-words*, p. 11, foot-note 2. — 360. I think *flocken* should be kept and taken to be a derivative of *flock* 'lock, tuft', meaning 'to pull off in flocks or tufts'. Hair is not *flocked* off. — 361. The emendation of *houe* to *gloue* is tempting. But *houe* may be OE *hōh* 'heel'. This word in ME came to mean 'hough, the hollow part behind the knee-joint' (found from 1508). It is conceivable that the heel at one time could be referred to as "the nether hough". In reality "naked to their heels" is more forceful than "naked to their leg coverings". — 866. *layke on his lesue* does not seem a probable emendation for ... *lesne*. The probable reading seems to be *his lese* 'these false people'. — 1255. *Derst* does not really belong to OE *dearr* 'dare'. The meaning is 'needed' and the word is a form of OE *þearf*. It is true there was in ME some confusion of this verb with OE *dearr*. *Derst* is probably corrupt.

The Glossary is very interesting reading. The text contains a considerable number of words otherwise unknown or else poorly exemplified in ME. I will draw attention among others to *archer* 'engine of war', *bole-fur* 'bale-fire', *by* 'village', *cate* 'purchase', *dommyn* 'fill up', *entre* 'take possession', *flatte* 'fall flat', *grate* 'lance rest', *kynde* 'to light', *poke* 'dagger', *quartote* 'cross-bow', *rispen* 'to break', *torfere* 'difficulty'. The number of Scandinavian loan-words is very large.

The following remarks may be made on some special points.

*Bew* 'fine' is used only with *clerk*, but *beauclerk* is really a compound, meaning 'a scholar'. — *Carieþ* 'goes' cannot come from ON *keyra*. — *Dongen* pret. plur. belongs to the OScand strong verb found in OSwed *diunga*, not to ON *dengia*. — *Feet* 1034 (*no freke þat on þe feet coupe*) is not translated. For *þe feet* one MS. has *surgery*. Evidently the word is here the ME form of *feat* 'art, knack'. — *Tolles* 537 in *tolles* of 'brings down' is derived from OE \**tollian* and compared with AFr. *toller* 'to carry off'. But the verb may be Engl. *toll* 'to take toll', here in the sense 'decimate'.

The present edition of Caxton's *Fayttes of Armes* contains a full Introduction (pp. xi-lv), a reprint of the text (pp. 1-292), two Appendices (pp. 293-299), an Index of Persons and Places (pp. 301-304), and a



Glossary (pp. 305-315). The edition is embellished by reproductions of three exquisite miniatures from manuscripts of the French original.

The *Fayttes of Armes* is a translation of the French *Les Faits d'Armes*, which was written in 1408-9 by Christine de Pisan. In the Introduction the editor gives a valuable account of Christine's life and work, of the MSS. and early prints of the French original, and a description of the extant copies of Caxton's print. The chief authorities for Christine's book are Vegetius's *Instituta rei militaris*, Frontinus's *Strategemata*, and *L'Arbre des Batailles* by Honoré Bonnet († c 1400), but she also used other sources and added some matter of her own. The book has no small interest, and as the original French does not seem to be accessible in a reprint, the present edition of Caxton's translation will be doubly welcome.

Caxton's translation is on the whole a very faithful rendering of the original. The changes chiefly consist in the omission of a few details, among other things one or two uncomplimentary references to the English.

The editor on pp. li ff. deals with the question of Caxton's style and technique as a translator. In the *Fayttes of Armes* "his style is at its best. He has a much firmer control of sentence structure, though he still loses his way occasionally in dealing with a complex French sentence. His vocabulary is more varied and virile, with a large proportion of native English words." The editor is unwilling to subscribe to Professor Chambers's criticism of Caxton as a prose writer. On the whole the later translations of Caxton show an improvement in comparison with the earliest ones; yet it can hardly be denied that the style is still rather heavy and too dependent on the French original. There are even in the *Fayttes of Armes* not a few cases where Caxton has misunderstood his French text, and his constructions are often un-English. The editor gives some instances of mistranslations (p. liv). Others might be added.

The edition is in the main a verbatim reprint of Caxton's text, though obvious misprints are corrected. The punctuation of the original is retained, which sometimes renders the text difficult to follow. The French text of the Introduction is printed at the bottom of the page, which makes it possible to some extent to form an idea of Caxton's method as a translator, and in the rest of the reprint passages from the original are frequently quoted in order to explain Caxton's text. Moreover, copious extracts from Vegetius are given below the text, for the purpose of illustrating how Christine used her sources.

There are in the printed text not a few corruptions that have not been corrected, or else misprints have crept in. Thus p. 12, 26. *tythe* must represent *tytle*; 23, 17. *apprence* seems to be for *apparence*; 36, 17. *þt* for *wt* (*with*); 61, 19. *to wyste for to wyte*; 67, 2. *theyre for thyne*. P. 112, 7. *cême* must be corrected to *clême*; the French text has *monter*. P. 140, 10. *cycuyte* for *cyrucyte*. P. 144, 26. *erthen pottes* for *potage* & for to *fede flesshe in hem*; *fede* gives no sense. P. 151, 6. *be he* stands for *he be*; 154, 12. *handre* for *hondre*; 156, 10. *the watre* for *be watre*; 162, 25. *halyllementes* for *habyllementes*; 163, 21. *hauerne* for *hauene*; 167, 1. *lyght* for *hyght* 'height'. P. 166, 9. *powrtlevez*; NED gives the form in this passage as *pount-levez*. P. 173, 12. *heny* stands for *heuy*; 174, 20. *lordes* doubtless for *bordes* 'boards'; 192, 32. *puttygne* for *puttynge*; 195, 30. *be for he*; 227, 38. *knyge* for *kynge*; 271, 28. *assayled* for *assoyled* 'absolved'.

The change of *y* *renge*d to *ys* *renge*d 99, 5 gives no sense. The correct reading is no doubt *yrenge*d 'ranged'. *Refute* 193, 6 should not have been changed to *refuge*. Cf. *refute* in NED. *Abassatoure* 234, 28 should hardly be altered to *ambassatoure*. We expect an indefinite article here, and the right form is very likely a *bassatoure* with apheresis of the first syllable.

The Epilogue (p. 291 f.) is available to me also in Crotch's reprint in E.E.T.S. 176. There are several discrepancies between the two texts, but I cannot decide which is correct. As a matter of fact various copies of Caxton's print may show some different spellings. The only important of these discrepancies are the following two. P. 291, 32, our ed. has *viij day of luyll*, whereas Crotch has *viij day of luyll*. P. 292, 1, our ed. has *for* as against *fro* in Crotch. The latter is the preposition demanded by the context. Other differences are: 291, 5. *frenche* (Cr. *frenshe*), 291, 12. *emprynte* (Cr. *enprynte*), 291, 24. *englysshe* (Cr. *englyshe*), 292, 15. *enterpryses* (Cr. *-prises*).

The glossary might well have been somewhat fuller. Several words in the text whose meaning is by no means immediately apparent are omitted. Thus *byleued* 19, 33 means 'left' or the like. *Consonant* 8, 18 means 'accordant'. *Flote* 80, 30 is 'company, troop'. *Emong* 44, 1, 129, 24 is 'sometimes', not 'among'. *Panes* 139, 8 'sections of a wall or fence' might have been explained. The meaning of *waued* 137, 15 is obscure. *Mygnotes* 23, 19 cannot well mean 'favourites'. It appears to mean 'delicacy' or the like. Cf. OFr *mignot* 'élégance' (in *au mignot*). The curious *mydelbare flyghynge* 154, 5, mentioned among guns and engines and contrasted with *grete engyns*, is not explained. *Mydelbare* is clearly Dutch *middelbaer* 'medium-sized', while *flyghynge* appears to be the pres. part. *flying*, possibly used here in the sense 'light'. Has an *and* been missed out between *mydelbare* and *flyghynge*? The French text ought to have been given in this case.

The *Short English Metrical Chronicle* now edited by Dr. Zettl is preserved in several MSS., a fact which testifies to a considerable popularity. One of these was edited by Ritson in *Ancient English Metrical Romances* 1802 (MS. R). The text of the Auchinleck MS. (A), together with the fragment in the Rawlinson MS. (H), was published in 1931 by Marion C. Carroll and Rosemond Tuve in the *Publications of the Mod. Lang. Association of America*, XLVI, no. 1. Further, the relation between the MSS. was made the subject of a special investigation by R. Sternberg in *Englische Studien* 18 (1893). But the present edition, which is founded on all the extant MSS., is very welcome, not least owing to the valuable introduction with which it is provided.

Five complete MSS. are known, besides two fragments and a prose translation into Anglo-French. The edition is based on the hitherto inedited MS. BM Add. 19677 (B), which is supposed to date from about 1390-1400. MS. Royal 12 C. XII in the British Museum (R) and the Auchinleck MS. (A) are earlier, while MSS. F and D (both in Univ. Libr. Cambr.) belong to the 15th century. The Chronicle begins with Brutus and goes down to the beginning of the reign of Edward II in B and F, to 1312 in R, to 1327-8 in A. In D there are additions which carry on the story till 1431. These additions are not included in the edition. The French translation

(MS. G, in Univ. Libr. Cambr.) was written shortly after 1307, the year of the accession of Edward II. Apparently the Chronicle was composed at that time, additions being subsequently made at various periods.

The Chronicle has no value as a historical source. The times the author must have known personally are dealt with very briefly. But it contains some legendary material that is of interest, e.g. the story of Maiden Inge, which replaces that of Hengist and is nowhere else so fully preserved as in the present text. Naturally the Chronicle is an interesting link in the series of early English historical writings.

In the full Introduction, which testifies to the editor's wide reading and learning, attention is devoted particularly to the relations between the MSS., the sources, the dialects of the various versions. The MSS., as has been already hinted at, show a good deal of variation among themselves. MS. A contains a good deal of material not found in any other MS. and apparently due to interpolation. Also other MSS. have portions not found in others. The editor tries, by means of a comparison between the various versions, to establish the original text. Here at the same time sources for the various items in the Chronicle are pointed out. On the whole the results may be accepted as at least near the truth. Obviously definite results can hardly be attained in a matter of this nature. At any rate the exact shape of the text must often remain doubtful.

The editor examines the dialect of the supposed original version and tries, by the help of rhymes, to determine the original language. He locates the version in Warwickshire. This conclusion is based chiefly on the fact that a few rhymes seem to point to W. Midl. *o* for *a* before nasals. Other criteria are mainly negative. But the rhyme-technique of the text is rather loose. Rhymes such as *hym : kyn*, *bat : spak*, *grete : lepe* are common. The original readings are by no means always certain. A rhyme such as *riche man : porcion* need not be original; *of renon* for *riche man* in H seems a far better reading. The rhyme *man : swikeldom* may have had *gome* instead of *man* originally, or else *-dam* instead of *-dom*. For the localisation of the extant MSS. there is better material to judge from, but I have the impression that the editor is apt to draw somewhat too definite conclusions from his data. The localisation of MS. D in or near Oxford is a definite gain; here there are other than linguistic facts to point to. But I am not sure we are warranted definitely to locate MSS. A and H in London, or MS. F in the Stoke-on-Trent-Crewe district.

Nothing is known about the author. The editor suggests with good reason that he was a cleric engaged in teaching, and that the Chronicle was intended as a rapid survey of English history for the instruction of the little educated parts of the community. His sources are difficult to establish, but he seems to have used the later version of Robert of Gloucester's *Chronicle*, *Le Livere de Reis de Brittanie*, perhaps William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum*, Layamon B, Geoffrey of Monmouth. But in the matter of the sources a good deal doubtless remains to be done.

On p. cxxix the editor suggests that the original version cannot have had more than about 900 lines of metre at the most. "The account was hardly more than a mere enumeration of facts — legendary "facts" as well as historical ones — and contained comparatively little episodic detail." This may well be true for what may be called the common ancestor of the extant versions. But behind this "original" I think one can discern a still



earlier chronicle, which was a good deal shorter and of the same type as the parts dealing with the post-Conquest kings, whose lives are dealt with in 6 lines or less. The biographical data are the length of the reign and the place of burial; and a line or two containing a very brief characterisation are added. Some of the earlier biographies are of the same type. An illustrative one is that of Arthur (ll. 243-8):

After hym regned kyng Arthur  
He was a man of gret fauor  
He was þe best knyȝt at nede  
Þat myȝte ride on eny stede  
He regnede to an tienti ȝer  
To Glastynbury men hym ber.

The first part of the biography of King Alfred is of the same type (ll. 441-6):

Afte hym regned þe goude Alured  
Þe wisist kyng þat euere et bred  
He made þoru goudes sonde  
Alle þe lawes of Engelonde  
& supþe he regned .xxiiiȝ. ȝer  
To Seynt Poules men hym ber.

I have no doubt the remaining 48 lines (447-94) dealing with Alfred's reign are a later addition.

My opinion is that the Chronicle is founded on a very short earlier chronicle containing biographies of the same kind as those quoted, in which little information was given beyond the length of the reign and the place of burial. The text would have been a kind of counterpart of the Old Norse *Ynglingatal*. The whole chronicle will have filled about 250 lines, that is some six lines to each of the 40 or so kings enumerated. It would probably be possible to restore with a fair amount of certainty the original form of the greater part of the chronicle, that is by a careful comparison of the various MSS. For the text seems to have been built up with the help of a few formulas or set phrases, which would be easy to memorize.

It will have been seen that the two extracts above end with the same formula, the *men hym ber* tag. The same formula is found in 13 other cases in MS. B, and MS. A adds another, where B omits the place of burial (Cnut). In one case it seems very probable that B originally had the same tag, viz. under Edward the Confessor, where & is *ischryned at Westmyster (: ȝer)* is easily emended into *To Westmyster men hym ber*. In several cases B omits the place of burial. In the remaining ones a different formula is used. One formula is used under Edward (ll. 705 f.) and Edmund (ll. 773 f.): *Jn Glastynburi he is In a scryne wel fair iwis* and & *nou at Buri he is In a wel fair schryne iwis*. Cf. also under Harold (ll. 846 f.): *At Seynt Clementis ibured he is Withoute Templebarre iwis*. Only once do we find in B a formula very common in MS. A, viz. under Henry III: *At Westmyster liggeþ his bon Ibured in a marbel ston*, but probably it was once found under Richard I, where B has: *At þe Fount Euerard liggeþ his bon*, to which MS. F adds: *Ibured in a marbul ston*. The *marbel ston* formula, usually in the form *gloken in a marbel ston* is found in A under Lud, Leir, Cassibalan, where B omits the place of burial; under Bladud the formula is instead *in a ston*. Under Edriȝt and

Edward, A has the *marbel ston* formula instead of B's *men hym ber* and under Ethelwulf instead of another formula in B.

It is clear that the whole question needs fuller treatment than can be given to it here. Only a suggestion or two can be offered. It is possible that the original chronicle had the *men hym ber* formula more or less regularly, and that the *marbel ston* one was regularly used in another chronicle of a similar type. Or perhaps more probably the original chronicle varied its formula for the burial place, the chief types being *men hym ber* and *marbel ston*. If the poem was partly transmitted orally, the original pattern would easily get into disorder.

The edition consists of three parts. In Part I the text of MS. B is printed in full with variants from other MSS. Part II contains all passages that do not exist in B or differ substantially from the B text. Part III contains the Anglo-French text in MS. G.

The Glossary (pp. 109-54) is full and reliable. I note that *ich* 48/81 cannot be a form of *eche* 'each'. It is a form of *ilke* 'same'. The rhyme shows that *eke* 374 must stand for *ilich* adv. 'likewise'. *Croizde* can hardly be a form of *cross*. It seems to be an OFr. *croiz deu* 'cross of God'. The texts contain a great number of proper names, especially place-names, which are booked in an Index of Proper Names (pp. 155-63). Some of the place-names may be of value to place-name study, but most are found in earlier records. *Alduc* 135 is clearly Alclyde, the old name of Dumbarton, not an old name of Dunbar, as the Index says. The statement that *Chering* (Charing, London) is so called, because Bishop Mellitus turned back there on his way to Westminster, is interesting, for the name means 'turning, bend'. *Toncastel* G appears to be Caistor in Lincs. See my Dictionary of English Place-names under *Thong*. *Vrokynghole* 56/128 is Wookey Hole in Somerset.

The two romances edited by Professor O'Sullivan are the last two of the English Charlemagne cycle still unprinted. Both are preserved in MS. Brit. Mus. Add. 37492, formerly called the Fillingham MS. from an earlier owner. The MS. was described by George Ellis, *Specimens of Early English Metrical Romances* (1805), and was long known only from that account. It was later lost to students till it was acquired by the British Museum in 1907. In Wells's Manual (1916) it is still reported as lost, but the mistake is rectified in the First Supplement.

The MS. is held to date from the second half of the fifteenth century. It is in a poor state of preservation. The earlier part of *Firumbras* is lost, and there is a gap due to the loss of seven folios in the text of *Otuel*. The editress suggests (p. xxiv) that the text of *Firumbras*, which shows many gaps, was copied from a MS. that had seen hard service. "This worn MS. was copied with the aim of preserving the legible portions of the text."

Though the two romances can hardly be said to stand very high as regards literary value and the text is badly corrupt, they naturally have no small interest as completing the Charlemagne cycle. We owe the editress a debt of gratitude for having rendered them accessible. The printed text, so far as can be judged from the specimen of the MS., appears to render the original faithfully.

The Introduction is mainly devoted to an attempt at determining the

origin and literary relationships of the two romances. Both are clearly translations from French romances, but the immediate sources are not preserved. The text of *Firumbras* (F), so far as it goes, deals with the same story as *Sir Ferumbras* in MS. Bodley Ashmole 33 (E.E.T.S., ES xxxiv), but the two are totally independent of each other. As regards *Otuel* (FO) the editress assumes that its first part (ll. 1-1691) has a common English source with the text of *Otuel* in the Auchinleck MS. But the metres of the two poems are different, our *Otuel* being written in a twelve-line, tail-rhymed stanza, the other in rhymed couplets of three feet. The verbal agreements between the texts listed on p. lv ff. are mostly either such as would naturally result from the use of a common French original, or else stock phrases found in any contemporary romance. In the vast majority of cases the texts show no verbal agreement. Also the text of *Otuel* in Brit. Mus. Add. 31042 (E.E.T.S., ES xxxv), though written in the same stanza as our *Otuel*, is unrelated. The second part of *Otuel and Roland* contains the story of the battle of Roncesvalles and the death of Roland. The ultimate source is Turpin's History of Charlemagne. The passages used for the romance are reprinted in the Notes (p. 147-153).

The portions of the Introduction that deal with literary relationships and the like are helpful and valuable. This cannot well be said of the section dealing with Language and Dialect (pp. lxix-lxxxiii). The Editress deals only with the spellings in the text and makes no use of the rhymes, which alone are of importance in determining the dialect and home of a text like the present one. She tells us that O.E. *ī* becomes *y* (as in *hys*), *in*, *it* being exceptions; that O.E. *ū* becomes *o* (as in *gonne*), *ful*, *vnder* being exceptions; that O.E. stable *ȳ* remains *y* (as in *fyre* 'fire'), *pride*, *hure* etc. being exceptions. We are told that O.E. *ȳ* becomes *y* in *dyd*, *sschylde*, *drynk*, etc., *e* in *scheld(e)*, *zelde*; here *sschylde* is O.E. *sci(e)ldan* vb., *scheld(e)* the same or O.E. *sc(i)eld* 'shield', while *drynk* is O.E. *drinc*. *Schene* (: *wene*) is rendered 'shiny' and held to contain O.E. *i*; the base is OE *scēne*. The interchange of *w* and *v* for *w* is taken to be due to Cockney influence. The rhyme *abyde* : *unredy* F 448-9 is held to prove the retention of the final -e of *abyde* (p. xx). Clearly *unredy* is corrupt for *unryde* 'enormous', which is found ll. 1247, 1352 and in FO l. 1229. These examples may suffice. The texts are localised in the East Midland. That is very likely correct, but there is no reason to assume that both come from exactly the same area, and the evidence adduced is not conclusive, as the rhymes have not been taken into consideration. The use of *ded* for *death* (e.g. FO 1894, 2100 etc., in F only in the rhyme *bedde* : *dethe* 1348 f.) tells in favour of East Midland. The two texts show some discrepancies as regards language. Thus in F OE *y* rhymes with *i* (as *ryde* : *pride*, *wyste* : *kest* 'kissed', *wylle* : *hulle*). In FO there are several rhymes *y* : *e*, as *dynt* : *yment*, *yknyt* : *fet*, *kynde* : *bonde* (for *bende* sb.): *sende* : *mynde* 'mind', *swerde* : *gerde* 'girt', but also *y* : *i*, as *spylt* : *mysgylt*, and even *y* : Fr. *u*, as *hure* 'hire' : *sure*, and OE *īe* : Fr. *u*, as *here* 'hear' : *sure*. In FO several rhymes between OE *ā* and *ǣ* are found, as *sare* : *bare* adj., *lawe* : *throwe* 'time' : *fawe* 'fain' : *awe*. There are no such rhymes in F.

The text is very corrupt, and many obvious mistakes are corrected in the edition, but a good many have been allowed to stand. The correct text can often be restored by the help of rhymes. A few examples may be given. Also some mistakes in the Glossary are corrected here.



F. 1. 18. *lystyn* should be *lyftyn* 'lifted'. 57. *vowe* is OE *wāg* 'wall', not a word for 'vault'. 93. *he* must be corrected to *she* or *we*. 124. *sayn* is no doubt *say*, an aphetic form of *assay* 'try'. 173. *y-holde* (: *golde*) is probably from OE *golden* or *gegolden* 'paid'. 223. *betydde* (: *wyde*) for *betyde* pres. subj. 405. so for *no*. 899. *sparche* for *sparkle*, a form otherwise found in the texts. 900. *ys tok* should be *ys stok* 'stuck'. 934. *sydon* 'sighed', not 'said'. 1235. *double* for *doubbe* 'dub, equip'. 1291. *went for hent* 'caught'.

FO, 1. 13. *ham* is rendered 'him' in the side-note. 318. *Dere worth* is not in the glossary. 383. *fable* (: *batayle*) stands for *fyale*. 399. the rhyme *heued* : *a-stoned* suggests *hond* : *astoned*. 442. *brouzt* corrupt for *bouzt* 'redeemed'. 453. *god* for *gold* (cf. l. 1441). 503. *tho* for *to* 'two'. 618. *chylde* (: *dede*) may be for *lede* 'man'. 734. *At* for *Ac*. P. 83 f. Askeward is killed twice in the side-notes, first by Roland, then by Oliver. L. 974. *drede* rhymes with *were* and is for *dere* 'hurt', which gives a far better meaning. 1128. *rived* doubtless for *riwed* 'rued' (cf. p. lvii). 1265. *sayde* (: *pride* etc.) for *cryde*. 1309. *he deth* for *to deth*. 1327-1330. The rhyme-words are no doubt *euermo* : *to*. 1654. *a country* means 'encounter'. 1685. *lawe* (: *day, say*) for *lay* 'law'. 1930. *knyztys* (: *lordynges*) for *kyngys*. 2254. *drowe* ('drove' in glossary) in *on a drowe* (: *knowe* etc.) probably for *on a rowe* 'in a row'. 2510. the 'thee' must be added after *saue*. 2528. (Absolon the) *whyte* for *wyghte*. 2566. *peys* for *prys*.

Lund.

EILERT EKWALL.

*Translations from the Classics into English from Caxton to Chapman 1477—1620.* By H. B. LATHROP. (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, no. 35). 350 pp. Madison. 1933. \$2.00.

This book has the rare virtue of uniting minutely accurate scholarship with breadth of vision.

It consists of an Introduction and four chapters: *The Age of Caxton* (1477—1517); *The Influence of Erasmus* (1517—1557); *Formative Influences in the Reign of Elizabeth* (1557—1593); *Professional Translators* (1593—1620). These are followed by a *Chronological List of Translations*, an *Alphabetical List of Translators*, a *Note on Miss Palmer's List of Editions and Translations* (the basic work in the field, to which Professor Lathrop expresses his indebtedness), a *Select List of References* and an Index.

This clear arrangement is characteristic of the whole work. Each chapter is written so as to form a series of brief essays, each of them dealing with one translator, whose view of the art is given, frequently in the form of quotations from one or more prefaces, and illustrated by means of a few characteristic passages. The style of these is then analysed minutely and compared with the original in such a way as to characterize the translator's general method. These characterizations are nearly always excellent. Even when treating of authors whose style has already been the subject of several monographs and articles, such as North, Holland

and Chapman, Lathrop remains independent in an unassertive way. Rarely does he polemize with predecessors, but his characterizations are often superior to theirs in being based on an observation of some fundamental quality of the translator's art, which had either escaped their notice or not been given due prominence. Thus neither George Wyndham<sup>1</sup> nor Francis Matthiessen<sup>2</sup> had so felicitously put the difference between North's and Holland's methods as Lathrop does in the following: "Holland translates not like North, mass by mass with easy nonchalance, but point by point—consciously and deftly."<sup>3</sup>

The style of the original, too, is sometimes characterized very well, as when Livy's sentences are described as "follow[ing] what may be called the order of revelation, details succeed[ing] each other as they would be perceived by an eye-witness. Thus his style combines picturesqueness with activity. The complete period builds up an impression, but it is not static, it moves constantly onward."<sup>4</sup>

The poet-translators are treated with equal originality, though here as elsewhere care is always taken to sum up the results of earlier critical studies. Thus a valuable touch is added to our picture of Chapman: "But more profound and more subtle than Chapman's alterations of Homer's style is his alteration of Homer's spirit, from its objective delight in the energetic manifestation of human activity, its *gusto*, to a tone of moral judgement, expressed in words of approval or reprobation."<sup>5</sup>

Some interesting facts are added to what is known of the development of Renaissance verse in England: thus Surrey's priority over Grimald as the first writer of English blank verse is proved almost conclusively — remarkably enough on the same grounds as has been done by Herbert Hartman in his introduction to the edition of Surrey's *Fourth Boke of Virgill*, which appeared in the same year (1933).<sup>6</sup> Such reliability in much-investigated problems inspires confidence in the author's facts and opinions where he is covering new ground. Indeed, though his is naturally a book for the specialist, Lathrop's knowledge of English (and European) literature of the 16th century is so great that his work may justly be described as a history of English 16th century literature as it is reflected in the translations from the classics.

One feels the same confidence in the well-written introductions and conclusions to each of the chapters. The opinions expressed there neither show a traditional bias, nor do they exhibit any conscious striving after originality: they are genuine conclusions reached after long years of disinterested study. In this respect the book contrasts favourably with a similar work: C. H. Conley's *The First English Translations of the Classics*<sup>7</sup>, in which the (comparatively slender) data do not entirely seem to justify the conclusion: "In view of the intimate relations of the renaissance Protestantism and the new political regime, is it not possible that after the

<sup>1</sup> in the introduction to: W. E. Henley — *The Tudor Translations*, vols. 7, 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Translation an Elizabethan Art*, Cambridge (Massachusetts), 1931.

<sup>3</sup> p. 242.

<sup>4</sup> p. 239.

<sup>5</sup> p. 287.

<sup>6</sup> Surrey's "*Fourth Boke of Virgill*." Edited with Introduction, Variant Readings and Notes by Herbert Hartman. London & New York: Oxford University Press. 1933.

<sup>7</sup> New Haven, 1927.

period of Spanish domination under Philip and Mary ending with the loss of Calais, the new nobility who had brought about the revolution in Edward's and Elizabeth's reigns, and the translators, both groups advocating much the same radical political, religious, and philosophical principles, had combined with 'Youth' as a slogan, for the improvement and enlightenment of the nation? This theory seems plausible from several considerations."<sup>8</sup> — Lathrop is of course on fairly safe ground in criticizing this somewhat startling theory, but his reasons for rejecting it are more final than might be expected.

The general introduction and conclusion are valuable for the same reason: they are felt to be the result of patient research conducted with a truly open mind. The author corrects Whibley's rather sweeping statement<sup>9</sup>: "the translators gave to England well nigh the whole wisdom of the ancients . . .", and rightly stresses the fact that "the names absent from the list of great works of antiquity made accessible for English readers is as notable as the names present on that list."<sup>10</sup> — "There is no early Greek lyric, no central drama or philosophy or oratory; nothing that is greatest in the Greece that still lives in thought."<sup>11</sup> — "The omissions in Latin literature are as notable," (nearly the whole of Plautus, Cicero's orations, the Roman lyric) — "The great wall of the Roman Empire rose before the eyes of the sixteenth century"<sup>12</sup>. . . . "To the 16th century reader that great classic past was the imperial age in which the order of human life had been best understood and organized by the intelligence of man."<sup>12</sup>

The wealth of material collected throughout the book forms sufficient evidence for this thesis as far as England is concerned. There is reason to suppose that the preference for imperial Rome is characteristic of the 16th century all over Europe, but we cannot be certain of this until the translations from the classics into all European languages of the time will have been studied as carefully as has been done for England in the present work.

London.

TH. WEEVERS.

---

<sup>8</sup> p. 34.

<sup>9</sup> *Cambridge History of English Literature*, vol IV, Chapter 1, p. 2.

<sup>10</sup> p. 307

<sup>11</sup> p. 13.

<sup>12</sup> p. 13.



*Florio's First Fruites.* By ARUNDELL DEL RE. (Memoirs of the Faculty of Literature and Politics, Taihoku Imperial University, Vol. III, no. 1) Published by the Taihoku Imperial University, Formosa (Japan), July 1936. Two volumes: I, Facsimile Reproduction of the Original Edition, pp. 241; II, Introduction and Notes, pp. lxiv + 149. Price not stated.

*Thomas Lodge.* By EDWARD ANDREWS TENNEY. Ithaca-New York, Cornell University Press; London, Milford, 1935. (Cornell Studies in English, XXVI). Pp. ix + 202. Price 9s.

*The Real War of the Theatres, Shakespeare's Fellows in rivalry with the Admiral's Men, 1594-1603; Repertories, Devices, and Types.* By ROBERT BOIES SHARPE. (The Modern Language Association of America, Monograph Series, V). Boston, D. C. Heath & Co., 1935. Pp. viii + 260. Price 11/6.

*Ben Jonson.* Edited by C. H. HERFORD and PERCY SIMPSON. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press. Vol. V, *Volpone, Epicoene, The Alchemist, Catiline*. Pp. xvi + 554. Price 21/—; Edition on handmade paper, to Subscribers only, 45/—.

In her work on *The Jacobean Drama*, Miss Ellis-Fermor wrote: "If we choose as our starting-point a picture that consists of spirals and related curves forming one design and, underlying them or superimposed, two-dimensional blocks of colour forming another and apparently independent design (in the manner of Picasso), we have a convenient starting-point for describing some of the characteristics of the structure of the *Alchemist*." This presentation may serve to stimulate the interest of sophisticated undergraduates in a play which, for all the intricacy of its plot, and its effectiveness on the stage (as we could witness a few years ago when it was revived by the Phoenix Society), is nothing more than a quintessence of traditional devices, and therefore belongs to a kind of art easily accessible to all — a kind of art which has little in common with Picasso's pictures. Miss Ellis-Fermor's simile, however, came back to my mind not while I was re-reading Ben Jonson's play in the critical text edited with his customary fastidiousness by Percy Simpson<sup>1</sup>, but in the course of my perusal of the third of the works of Elizabethan history and biography mentioned at the beginning of this note. Conjecture plays a large part in it. If to the uncertainty of dates and data you add the ubiquitous element of allegory — and Elizabethan allegory, as Prof. Sharpe warns us, is of an extremely wavering nature, it allows itself great freedom to change from one identification to another — you have as a result a picture which comes very near to Picasso's abstract type of unconscious symbolism. "It would be much better if we could altogether abandon the word 'painting' for such an activity" — said Herbert Read apropos of Picasso; and I would equally like to suggest that the kind of guesswork which is going on about some Elizabethan figures and events forms a field apart which has little to do with the study of

<sup>1</sup> I fail to see, though, why the reading of Act V. sc. xii, 143 of *Volpone*: "Thy wrongs done to *my* wife", given by Prof. Simpson, should not be corrected, at least in the footnotes, into "... *thy* wife", as it should read.

literature. By this I do not intend to put a slur upon the method used by Miss Frances A. Yates in her work on Florio, and by Prof. Sharpe in his ingenious version of the rivalry between the Chamberlain's and the Admiral's men. I only maintain that the results are much less relevant to the understanding and appreciation of literature than those of a work of psychoanalysis of the type of Marie Bonaparte's on Edgar Poe (Paris 1933). Because psychoanalysis, even of the boldest type (and everybody will agree that Princess Bonaparte's was such), deals with internal allegory; it may distort a picture, but it generally widens our realisation of its possible implications. But topical allusion of the hazy kind affected by the Elizabethans — and, in Prof. Sharpe's own words, *The Faerie Queene* is sufficient evidence that the Elizabethans did not require their allegories to be clear or consistent — is a purely external thing, does not add depth to the meaning of a passage any more than the fact that beads could be employed as a suitable currency with natives adds to their beauty. Topical allusion may help to establish the date of a play or a poem, but Prof. Sharpe generally follows the opposite course, i.e. tries to build his construction on works whose date is practically certain. What advantages, then, accrue to literary history, or to history at large, from Prof. Sharpe's identification of the Admiral's men with the interests of the Cecilian party, and of the Chamberlain's men with those of the Essexians? Perhaps the instance I am going to quote is not quite fair, because Prof. Sharpe is frequently more to the point than in this case, but quote it I must, as a typical illustration of the sterility of this kind of research (a research which, on the other hand, requires a minute familiarity with State Papers family archives etc., in short, an utterly disproportionate preparation):

Shakespeare adds [in *King John*] the slightly sentimental part of the Dauphin, and the brief one of James Gurney, servant of Lord Faulconbridge. The latter addition has seemed to me curious. Why should a dramatist under the stern necessity of compression add the slight but circumstantial bit? Just for realism? It is possible. But we ought, in considering the effect Shakespeare looked for in using the name, to have in mind that the Gurneys or Gournays were a great Norman family, with descendants of the name in several parts of Elizabethan England, and blood in the veins and possessions in the hands of several great houses. [Footnote: Daniel Gurney, *The Record of the House of Gournay*. It is curious that in these two large volumes I have nowhere been able to find James used as a Christian name by this very numerous family.] It would be interesting to discover which of Shakespeare's contemporaries quartered the Gournay arms.

Although it is hard to say whether Gurney's appearance in *King John* was meant to be complimentary or not, [Footnote: Anthony Gurney, Anne Boleyn's second cousin, married a Tyrrell, supposed descended from the Tyrrell honored by Shakespeare's company in *Satiromastix*] at least it was a historical bit of sufficient interest to be of value to the play; and I am inclined to think that Shakespeare, in making him a servant of the Faulconbridges, intended a slight slur. The lands of Hugh de Gournay, who was with Richard Cœur de Lion in Palestine, descended to Lord Bardolph, and some of them thence to the Stanhopes of Shelford, Nottinghamshire, Cecilians, whose connections with *1 Henry IV* will appear later. But probably the best known of all the family was a Gurney of the Somerset branch (related through Newton to the Cobhams, who objected to Shakespeare's making fun of their ancestor Oldcastle), Thomas de Gournay, who joined Maltravers in the murder of Edward II at Berkeley Castle. It is possible that in Marlowe's *Edward II*, in which Gurney is a character, the Admiral's men owned a valuable property which for political reason they dared not use; the policy of the Cecilians — at least as it appeared later — being to connect *Richard II*, the Chamberlain's story of the deposition and murder of a king, with Essex's supposedly treasonable ambitions. Thus they may have refused to let their own players perform a dramatic story

so very similar in its political implications. At least we have no evidence that the Admiral's men ever performed *Edward II* during our period. Can Shakespeare's Gurney embody a sly allusion to this situation? (p. 55-56).

The only use I can see of this passage is as an illustration of dubitative modes. Notice what a rich variety: *it is hard to say, I am inclined to think, it is curious, it seemed to me curious, it would be interesting, we have no evidence, it is possible* (twice), *probably, at least* (three times), *they may, can...?, why should...?*

But let us take what Prof. Sharpe calls the clearest case of personal lampooning in the productions of Shakespeare and his fellows, the presentation of the martyred ancestor of the Cobhams as a buffoon:

Yet in asserting that the character of Oldcastle was a lampoon on Cobham, I do not wish to be misunderstood to mean that he was only that. Much of the objection raised by conservatives against any and all contemporary identification in Shakespeare's plays is based on a sound feeling that Shakespeare was not a writer of political and personal squibs. May we not believe that the character we know as Falstaff was sketched in as a braggart soldier type, elaborated with all the resources of genius aided by an appreciative observation of many of the contemporaries who have already been suggested by seekers for his prototype — and doubtless of others who remain still to be suggested — and at last given, under some pressure from outside, enough identification with the historical Oldcastle and the contemporary Cobham to make the allusion cause especial delight in the one camp and resentment in the other? By pressure from outside, I mean influences working upon those loyalties to persons which any man must have, however non-partisan his philosophy, however great his devotion to his art: in Shakespeare's case his loyalties to his personal patron, company's patron, fellow-sharers, and audience. (p. 73).

As one sees, the degree of identification of Shakespeare's character with a real person is even slighter than in the case of some of the Canterbury pilgrims, according to Prof. Manly's researches. How are we advanced by knowing that Chaucer's Knight has common traits with some members of the Scrope, as well as of the Derby families, or that his Franklin may be recognisable in John Bussy or maybe in Stephen de Hales? And what more do we learn about Shakespeare as a man and as an artist, when we know that the name of Oldcastle (because the analogy can hardly extend beyond mere homonymy) caused delight in the Essex and resentment in the Cecil camp?

I do not mean to imply that Prof. Sharpe's story of rivalries is a phantastic tale of his own invention; I believe that such petty retorts as he surmises and painstakingly illustrates actually existed in Elizabethan society, but I think that they form a chronicle which to a large extent can be safely ignored by the historian, and must be entirely dismissed by the literary historian. It is not there that lies the value of Prof. Sharpe's contribution, but in the light he throws incidentally on the taste of the period, in his tentative characterisation of the kind of audience for which each company catered, in his brief but excellent surveys of such *motifs* as the Jew on the stage, the girl-page device, the domestic crime plays, the Greek plays, etc. Indeed it seems a pity that such an amount of scholarship and ingenuity should have been lavished upon a subject whose very nature eludes investigation: "The Elizabethan eye saw when it chose; indeed it was greatly sensitized by the official suppressing of news and discussion; on other occasions it could wink ...."



An episode of the Cecil-Essex rivalry would have as its central figure John Florio, if we are to accept Miss Yates' hypothesis that Burleigh appointed Florio as tutor to Southampton and Rutland when they were minors under his guardianship in order to spy developments in the Essex camp. This hypothesis would remove the chief objection against the surmise that Shakespeare ridiculed Florio in *Love's Labour's Lost*. But to what would, in conclusion, amount Shakespeare's ridiculing of Florio? I do not think Miss Yates' book on Florio would deserve the high rank to which it is entitled in the research-work of the last few years, if its upshot was all in the final sentence: "I think Florio is certainly represented in *Love's Labour's Lost*. I would hesitate to say that either Holofernes or Armado is an exact portrait of him — they evidently owe much to the *commedia dell'arte* types — but I believe that at times both these characters, and particularly Holofernes when quoting the proverb, spoke in a way which the audience would recognise as Florio's very voice and manner." A book has since been based on this kind of guesswork, *The School of Night*, which in the field of Elizabethan studies is the counterpart of Luigi Valli's *Fedeli d'amore* in the field of Dante scholarship. Such books have the effect of making one almost yearn for the old-fashioned method of filling up gaps in tentative biographies, by deftly inserting general descriptions of historical background, atmosphere, etc. This seems to be the method of E. A. Tenney in his attempt at a full-length portrait of Thomas Lodge which takes into account half a century of scattered investigations. We know little about Lodge's education, but we know enough about Elizabethan schools to be able to supply readable padding about school regulations, examinations, customs, etc.: in this way a whole chapter can be written about the early education of Thomas Lodge, Gentleman. We do not know how Lodge managed to receive his degree of doctor in physic at Montpellier at the end of one year instead of three, but we know enough about the customs of the Montpellier students to imagine (p. 157) Lodge viewing with the amused smile of one who had outgrown the exuberance of youth the favourite games of the *barbe* and the *batacule*. Did Thomas follow his father's body to the grave on February 17, 1584? If he did, "he must have been sorely vexed and angry at the stern old man lying there in the casket. But whatever he felt, he would have seen the brilliant Elizabethan funeral ...." Mr. Tenney, one imagines, would have felt perfectly at home in the years when Masson wrote his delightfully Victorian sketch of young Milton: "Look back, reader, and see him as I do! Now, under the elms on his father's lawn, he listens to the rural hum, and marks the branches as they wave, and the birds as they fly .... Over this landscape, changing its livery from day to day, fall the varying seasons .... And these seasons have each their occupations. Now the plough is afield .... In summer the twilight steals slowly over the lawn, etc." Mr. Tenney's tendency to fictional padding has produced an exquisite *pastiche*, the sixth chapter, on Lodge's South Sea voyage, composed from several accounts in the style of the period. On the whole, Lodge's life is typical of the same transition period which saw Donne turning from courtier, adventurer, and love poet, into a divine and a preacher. Lodge, a typical roisterer, gentleman-soldier, law-student, and miscellaneous writer in the first part of his life, becomes later a physician, translates *The Workes both Morrall and Natural of Lucius Annaeus Seneca*

and Simon Goulart's comment on Du Bartas, and, to give the finishing touch to a gloomy seventeenth-century picture, dies of the plague.

Florio, too, died of the plague in the following year, but he had not evolved with the times. He remained through life an able, sycophantic teacher, a refugee and *poligrafo* of the Cinquecento, of the Gabriel Symeoni type: his chief merit is to have brought Italy nearer to such men as Shakespeare and Ben Jonson. The editor of the facsimile reproduction of Florio's *First Fruites*, Prof. Arundell del Re, has been forestalled by Miss Yates in the publication of researches on Florio's life he had begun many years ago; he was the first to draw attention, in *The Secret of the Renaissance* (Tokyo, 1930), to Florio's MS. Italian translation of King James' *Basilikon Doron* in the British Museum. In his introduction and notes to the *First Fruites* Prof. del Re qualifies some of the statements made by Miss Yates in her life of Florio; for instance he considers it very unlikely that the Joannes Florentinus entered in the register of the University of Tübingen on May 9th 1563 might be Florio himself, and refuses to believe that he should have acted as a spy on Southampton, because "his personal loyalty cannot be seriously called into question". Unfortunately Prof. del Re's opinions on these points are not accompanied by proofs, while the proofs he brings forward of Florio's either direct or indirect connection with the dyers' trade are not very convincing: the attack on dyers in the *First Fruites*, if it does not contain the covert allusion to Sir Edward Dyer Miss Yates supposes, does not, on the other hand, prove that Florio began earning his life as a dyer ("the best dyers at the time were, it seems, foreigners") and afterwards left the trade because of the discourtesy and covetousness of "masters and patrons"; and the reference to himself Florio makes in the address to the Italian merchants at the beginning of the *First Fruites* is not as a *povero artigiano*, as Prof. del Re says, but as a *povero artefice* — a slip which somewhat weakens the case (although, of course, the two words can be considered synonyms in the present connection). Prof. del Re's Anglo-Italian upbringing and teaching career would have qualified him — one would think — to pronounce authoritatively on the kind of Italian Florio writes. But he does not proceed beyond the mere statement of the linguistic problem (II, pp. 143-4): "A careful examination of the words used by Florio would certainly throw interesting light upon his connections with Italians in London who, far more than books, provided him with a vocabulary of the spoken language". He notices Venetian spellings of words in the list of spices, and suggests that Florio "had derived his information from Venetian merchants, who were the principal importers of such goods"; but he ought to have stressed the fact of the presence of Venetian and Lombardo-Venetian forms throughout the *First Fruites*, such as *giande* for *ghiande* (acorns), *ungie* for *unghie* (nails), *bombeligo* for *ombelico* (navel), *soppiare* for *soffiare* (to blow), *ameda* (aunt), *neza* (niece), *tegna*, *pizigare*, *malado*, *miglioradi*, etc. The Venetian and generally Northern Italian colouring of Florio's vocabulary involves wider issues than the character of Florio's language, as I shall say in a moment. Another fact which shows that Florio picked up his vocabulary among merchants is the presence of exotic words in a thin Italian disguise, as happens nowadays with Italians established in America: gallicisms such as *bona cera* (*bonne chère*), *giocar di poma* (cf. *jeu de paume*), *potto* (*pot*), *dangerosa* (*dangereuse*), *pilagio* (*pillage*), *inrizzato* (corresponding to

*hèrissé* in the phrase *castagno intrizzato*), anglicisms such as *pacuzo* (*pack-house*), *tubbaro* (the English correspondent given by Florio is "cooper", but the word seems derived from *tub*, the most common wooden vessel made or repaired by coopers, through an easy association of sound with Venetian *botaro*), *pilgrimaggi* (*pilgrimages*), *Scepa* (*Cheap*, i.e. Cheapside), *Carisee* (*Carsies*, i.e. kersies), *scandalezare* in the non-Italian sense of to slander, etc. As for the many proverbs quoted in the *First Fruites*, Prof. del Re rightly qualifies Miss Yates' hasty conclusion that Florio "pillaged" James Sanford's *Garden of Pleasure*, by pointing out that the material in question not only belonged to the common stock of proverbs found in practically every collection, such as the famous one compiled by Piovano Arlotto, but could be gathered directly from the lips of the Italian merchants with whom Florio associated in London.

A good portion of Prof. del Re's notes is dedicated to the tracing of sources of Florio's conversations (in a few cases he has been unable to quote chapter and verse of Guevara's books, as these were not available to him in Japan), and to the description of Elizabethan customs, institutions, etc. for the benefit of Oriental students. While Florio's Italian is far below the high standard of writing generally attained in XVIth-century Italy, his English "could not, by reason of its uncouthness and lack of naturalness, have failed to raise a smile from English pupils". The work bears clear signs of having been "very hurriedly and carelessly revised and printed". Unfortunately these same words could apply to Prof. del Re's edition, apart, of course, from the extremely useful section containing the facsimile. The Introduction and notes teem with misprints, luckily of a kind which can be easily corrected by the reader, except in a few cases (for instance, II, p. 95, instead of *Lonara's* read *Zonaras'*, the Greek historian). But Prof. del Re has attempted to correct in the notes the misprints of the original text of the *First Fruites*, and not only has overlooked many of those misprints (for instance, p. 69 of the facsimile: *adverf-ta*, read *adversità*; p. 81, *gierno*, read *giorno*; p. 90, *Masa*, read *Musa*; p. 116, *iei*, read *lei*; p. 119, *construtto*, read *constretto*; p. 120, *Iddo*, read *Iddio*; p. 123, *E uh lingua*, read *E' una lingua*; p. 124, *Ma par*, read *Ma pur*; *l'sperientia*, read *l'esperientia*; *viro*, read *vero*; p. 126, *loggo*, read *leggo*; and dozens of similar misprints), but sometimes lets new errors slip into the very corrections; thus on p. 81 of the notes he warns us to read *Plono* of p. 75 of the text as *Plinio*, but the text in fact has *Plino*; on p. 138 he corrects *di ubire* of p. 201 of the text by *disubidire*, while it should be *di ubidire* (English counterpart: *in obeying*); on p. 140 he corrects by *darei* instead of *darci* the misprint *darsi* of p. 216 of the text, and omits to correct *si lamenteressimo* by *ci lamenteressimo*, and *i suoi venti furibondi dei suoi travagli* by suppressing the first *suoi*. Such inaccuracies, for which no doubt the difficulty of printing a work of this kind in Formosa is largely responsible, are likely to make Prof. del Re's edition less valuable than it would otherwise have been to students with little knowledge of Italian.

Once we have established the predominant Venetian or Lombardo-Venetian colouring of Florio's vocabulary — and we have seen (p. 38 of *First Fruites*) that Venice is for Florio the Italian town *par excellence* — we may be able to understand why local allusions in Shakespeare's Italian plays are confined to a very definite part of Italy: Venice, and the neighbouring towns Verona, Padua, Mantua; and Milan. No local allusions



occur in *Much Ado*, where the scene is an imaginary Messina, nor in the part of *All's Well* which takes place in Florence. And we may guess why Ben Jonson gave to Florio a copy of his Venetian play, *Volpone*, with an autograph inscription styling him "his loving Father, & worthy Freind .... The ayde of his Muses". The suggestion that the "ayde" which Florio had rendered Ben Jonson's muse probably consisted in helping him with the Italian details in *Volpone* finds countenance in what we know of Florio's Italy. We feel, however, with Percy Simpson that the I. F. who wrote verse tributes for *Volpone* and *Catiline* is more plausibly to be identified with John Fletcher than with John Florio (as Miss Yates and others believe). Miss Yates writes that Jonson may have studied Florio's manuals by himself, "or, more probably, have taken lessons from Florio in the course of which his inquiring mind absorbed information about mountebanks and other features of Italian life." But what strikes one about *Volpone* is not so much the abundance of Italian information, and the curiosity of Italian words deftly inserted to give a touch of local colour, as the truly Aretinesque *ὕβρις* of the play, the exuberance of details of decadent life, which, drawn as they were in part from accounts of Imperial Rome, were nevertheless equally true of the Venice of the XVI-XVIIth centuries. Ben Jonson may mention Aretino only for his legendary prints (Act III, sc. 7), but in *Volpone* he came closer than any other writer of the time to the picturesque eloquence, the art of making words actually ferment and flaunt and spurt their meaning, the gusto in watching degradation, the thrill experienced in yielding to the fascination of unnecessary risk, which were proper to the author of the *Ragionamenti*, the Scourge of Princes, the very embodiment of corrupt Venice, Pietro Aretino. Was it through Florio, or largely through his own poetic intuition of something enormous and truculent in the ways of sin (almost a foretaste of the Marquis de Sade), that Ben Jonson wrote *Volpone*, which may be paradoxically defined the best of Aretino's plays? Or was it the Duke of *Measure for Measure* (a play whose influence is traceable in many phrases of *Volpone*), suddenly gratifying the hidden leanings of his soul, giving full scope to his crotchets, and turning *voyeur* for the sake of evil instead of good, that was reborn by metempsychosis in the body of a Venetian Magnifico, the Hyde of that Jekyll? Certainly throughout Jonson's work we can feel the spell exercised on the dramatist by a titanic transgressor, a Sejanus, a Volpone, a Catiline (in *Subtle the Alchemist* the figure descends to the level of comedy). *Catiline*, however, the last of the plays in the fifth volume of the Clarendon Press edition, fails to come up to expectation. Passages like:

Lentulus, this man  
If all our fire were out, would fetch downe new,  
Out of the hand of IOVE; and rivet him  
To *Caucasus*, should he but frowne: and let  
His own gaunt Eagle flie at him, to tire,

and the closing one, about Catiline's death, with the two long similes of the Lybian lion and the Medusa-struck giant (a passage which clearly anticipates *Paradise Lost*), do little to compensate for the able, but not stirring, versification of historical sources.

*Nederland en Shakespeare. Achttiende Eeuw en Vroege Romantiek.* Door Dr. R. PENNINK. 's-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff. 1936. viii + 304 pp. f 5.—, geb. f 6.50.

In the age of Vondel's balanced art a few minor playwrights show signs of familiarity with plays of Shakespeare (played in Holland by English actors). Miss Pennink manages to deal with the whole of the seventeenth century in the Introduction to her dissertation and in doing so fortunately does not yield to the common temptation to argue always to the influence of great authors on one another.

French classicism continues to dominate till about 1770. In Chapters I and II, which cover the years 1700-80, the writer quotes opinions about Shakespeare both from books translated from English and from Dutch writers; among the latter, as one might expect, one finds either a Voltairean misconception or English admiration tempered by Dutch reserve. About 1780 (see Chapter III of the book), besides a *Hamlet* after Ducis and an 'improved' *Othello*, both in alexandrines, there is a prose translation in five volumes of fifteen plays. Vols. I-III, translated anonymously from the German prose of Eschenburg (1775/7), are in a few pages of examples such as (p. 66) I Henry IV, iv. 1: "Deze lofspraak zou ons eerder de koorts als krijgslust doen krijgen" ("Diesz Lob erregt mehr Fieber, als Märzlufft": "worse than the sun in March, / This praise doth nourish agues") pilloried by Miss Pennink as worse than clumsy. Vols. IV and V, translated from the original, are, however, on a higher level; the writer has gone to much trouble to collect information about the translator, Brunius, but without important results.

When after 1770 the influence of German and English aesthetic ideas increases, the attitude to Shakespeare changes; in Chapter IV the writer illustrates this with quotations, principally from Bilderdijk and Feith. In these years the Bellamy circle strive to free Dutch poetry from the domination of Vondel, and it is remarkable that from this group should have come a translation of "To be or not to be" which only in modern times has been noticeably surpassed. Miss Pennink rather one-sidedly stresses the weak points in this translation (by Hinlopen, 1798), and in her Appendix prints it besides various others, among them the un-Shakespearean rhyming version of Bilderdijk (1783), which she three times calls 'mooi' and 'vrij' (pp. 102, 143, 145).

The second half of her book is devoted to the years 1800-40. This period is again much more sympathetic towards Shakespeare, no doubt principally as a result of German criticism. Of the greatest interest are the views quoted from the periodical *Athenaeum* (1836/7), clearly based on Hegel. The quotation on p. 245 is even literally translated from his *Aesthetics*, a fact which has escaped Miss Pennink's notice.

About 1835 there are good translations by Moulin (*Macbeth*, *Othello*, *The Tempest*) and Roorda van Eysinga (*Hamlet*). From the reviews of these in the periodicals the writer shows how ideas (about blank verse also, for example) have changed towards the end of the period with which she deals.

The large amount of material, especially about Moulin, on which Miss Pennink draws, the clear arrangement and the fluent style make her book, from which we have been able to touch lightly on only a few points, very

attractive. The only thing that surprised us was to find in an academic dissertation a query after the perfectly ordinary commercial expression 'à costi' (letter from Moulin to a publisher, p. 215) and on the back of a publication by Martinus Nijhoff the division 'Shakes-peare'.

A short chapter on Performances, a Conclusion, an Appendix containing a few fragments of translations, and a none too full Index complete the book. If ever the writer should provide us with a standard work on Holland and Shakespeare between 1840 and 1940, I hope she will include an English summary.

The Hague.

C. A. ZAALBERG.

*Lessing's Relation to the English Language and Literature.* By C. C. D. VAIL. (Columbia University Germanic Studies, New Series, No. 3). New York: Columbia University Press. London: Milford. 1936. vi + 220 pp. 15s. net.

It is surprising that there should have been until now no comprehensive study of a subject so important especially for comparative literature. As regards Lessing's relation to the English language (Part I, pp. 11-90), the very first pioneer work had still to be done: the little that Roethe and Muncker have said on this subject is too general and inconclusive to be considered even as preliminary work. Mr. Vail makes a close study of the extensive material and illustrates by excellently chosen examples how Lessing's knowledge of English became year by year more perfect. Already as a student he was able to quote it accurately and to translate from authors like Thomson and Pope and Cibber those passages which he needed. The translation of the works of Hutcheson and Law in 1756 and of Richardson's Aesop in the following year affords truly astonishing evidence of Lessing's intimate knowledge of English. These works, which have been overlooked by most of his biographers and are now investigated for the first time in their character as translations, show a command of English words and idioms and thought-complexes that entitles him to a place among the really outstanding German translators of English material. Although his originals were of slight interest for content and the language was in general too archaic and too involved in eighteenth-century complexities to be agreeable or even easy reading, Lessing was able to reproduce this theological, ethical and sociological material very correctly and aptly. Misunderstandings and mistranslations there are, to be sure, some so unmotivated that they can be explained only as *lapsus mentis*, but over against these are such telling reproductions of English idiom that they must be put down as flashes of genius. The dust-covered translations of the English moralists, and the narrative and critical renderings from Cibber and Richardson, supply proof that English prose and verse from Shakespeare to the eighteenth-century drama could have caused him no difficulty.

Part II (pp. 93-200) deals with Lessing's relationship to English sources.



Here, as he could not do in Part I, the author can build on the work of numerous predecessors (Erich Schmidt, Muncker, Albrecht, Kies, Gundolf and many others). In general, however, he achieves more than his fore-runners in that (1) he works strictly chronologically and thus gives a clearly defined view of Lessing's development with all its ups and downs; (2) he takes into consideration all the material, not only Lessing's dramatic works but also his projects and fragments and, last but not least, his critical writings; he considers especially the development of the critical foundation of his creative work, here also viewed always in relation to his English sources; and (3) he does not restrict himself to these English sources but always keeps his eyes open for his author's French and classical and other sources, thereby succeeding in achieving a full understanding of Lessing's gradual progress from earlier forms and patterns to those derived from the English and of the relative importance of the latter during the formative years of his art.

The comprehensive view adopted under this last heading is of the greatest value. Lessing's famous pro-British and anti-French campaign, which after years of preparation first appears in full strength in the *Literaturbriefe*, was by Mr. Vail's predecessors often, as a result of generalising too completely, much too one-sidedly stressed. The generally accepted interpretation of the trend of German literature in the second half of the eighteenth century sees the rise of English influence on Germany as part of a movement that kept pace with the decline of French prestige. This is also the traditional view among the interpreters of Lessing. Mr. Vail's investigations show, however, that the tradition of Lessing's discovery of an affinity for English models and his rejection of the French is true only of special crises in his work and cannot be generalised to represent his entire spiritual progress. While his advancement in a knowledge of English sources and an appreciation of English drama cannot be denied, the expression of this development in his works varies widely at different periods. While the weakening of French patterns as regards tragedy is apparent, this development cannot be extended to apply to other forms, nor is it so absolutely true respecting tragedy as is often stated.

As the greatest value of these investigations lies just in the many subtle details which the chronological method reveals step-by-step in Lessing's development, there is little use within the frame of a short notice in giving any fuller summary of the results at which the writer arrives. Even his own Conclusion — "The Profile of Lessing's English Interest" (pp. 203-11) — gives but a feeble impression of the rich contents of this first-rate study.

A very comprehensive Bibliography and an Index conclude this exceedingly well-produced volume.

The Hague.

LÉON POLAK.

*The Note-Books and Papers of Gerard Manley Hopkins*,  
 edited with notes and a Preface by HUMPHRY HOUSE. xxxvi  
 + 472 pp. Oxford University Press. 1937. 25/—.

Mr. Humphry House's valuable book comprises extracts from the early note-books of Gerard Manley Hopkins, his *Journal*, notes for lectures, some sermons, and notes on the *Spiritual Exercises* of Ignatius Loyola. This is not all the available material, as Mr. House informs us in his interesting preface dealing with the provenance of the MSS. There are still unpublished notes and papers, and the editor found that his chief difficulty lay in presenting a representative selection without giving the illusion of completeness. His collection is a preliminary work to a biography of the poet, to which we may look forward with great interest. Hopkins' papers were scattered after his death, and he destroyed many of them in his life-time. His work on Greek metres, Duns Scotus' philosophy, and the text of Aristophanes, seems to be irretrievably lost, or perhaps only planned and never carried out. But the greatest loss is the diary in which he recorded events of his spiritual and moral life. This would surely have thrown much light upon that spiritual crisis which he passed through, reflected and yet veiled in the extant poems, when, as Bridges wrote,

God's terror held thee fast  
 In life's wild wood at Beauty and Sorrow aghast :  
 Thy sainted sense trammelled in ghostly pain.

But the *Journal*, still extant and published by Mr. House, is precious in itself, covering as it does the years 1868-75, those immediately following upon his reception into the Jesuit novitiate, during which only five letters were written to Bridges. It contains, too, some scattered spiritual notes. The most interesting thing however is the wonderfully accurate and poetic observation of nature which it reveals — notes on clouds and shapes of trees and effects of light, materials for poems, some perhaps never written, some no longer preserved. The early note-books are especially valuable in that they preserve a number of drafts, some of poems already published (e.g., *Rest*), some of poems which Hopkins almost certainly burned in their final stage. Many of them are fragments of poetic dramas which he planned and never completed, though none of them are as fine as the chorus from *St. Winefred's Well* published by Bridges with Hopkins' poems in 1918. Another valuable item in the early note-books is the Platonic dialogue *On the Origin of Beauty*, in which beauty is seen to consist in the proportion between variation and uniformity. The lecture notes published by Mr. House deal with *Rhythm and other structural parts of Rhetoric — verse and Poetry and Verse*. These notes were written in 1873 and 1874 and lead up to the most important *exposé* of his views on metre apart from the preface to his poems — the twelfth letter to Canon Dixon (1881). His conception of Sprung Rhythm is not yet clearly defined and an evolution in it is plainly discernible when the lecture notes, the letter to Dixon and the preface to the poems are considered together. The sermons shew the personal peculiarities of their author as clearly as do those of Donne, and may indeed be found to be as important in their way. Mr. House has only published a selection of them. In one is included Hopkins'

## definition of genius :

You know what genius is, brethren — beauty and perfection in the mind. For perfection in the bodily frame distinguishes a man among other men his fellows: so may the mind be distinguished for its beauty above other minds and that is genius. (p. 263)

## and in another the characteristic explanation of the term "Paraclete":

... a Paraclete is one who calls us on to good. One sight is before my mind, it is homely but it comes home: you have seen at cricket how when one of the batsmen at the wicket has made a hit and wants to score a run, the other doubts, hangs back, or is ready to run in again, how eagerly the first will cry / Come on, come on! — a Paraclete is just that, something that cheers the spirit of man with signals and with cries, all zealous that he should do something and full of assurance that if he will he can... (p. 287).

The Sermons, the notes on the *Spiritual Exercises* of Ignatius Loyola, and indeed all the material in this volume, shew what Mr. House calls the "compound of intimately personal observation and academic work" and the "fusion of 'compulsory' and spontaneous mental life" (p. xxiv) so characteristic of the poet. A phrase from an *Essay on Poetic Diction* seems significant in this connexion :

... where the structure forces us to appreciate each syllable it is natural and in the order of things for us to dwell on all modifications affecting the general result or type which the ear preserves and accordingly with such as are in themselves harmonious we are pleased ... (p. 94)

Hopkins, with his strong belief, enhanced by the traditions of his order, in a God-ordered universe, dwells on all modifications affecting the general result or type, and this may serve in part to explain those vivid notes and impressions of natural scenes which he has recorded in writing and in his drawings. The drawings — admirably reproduced as illustrations to the book — often explain and complete the notes, and here, as in the notes, Hopkins' chief attention seems directed to the forms and variations in trees and water. The drawing "At the Baths of Rosenlauri, July 18" made during Hopkins' walking-tour in Switzerland in 1868 (facing p. 106) is a good example and so is his note on the Handeck waterfall :

I watched the great bushes of foam-water, the texture of branchings and water-spandrils which makes them up. At their outsides nearest the rock they gave off showers of drops strung together into little quills which sprang out in fans. (p. 106).

At the end of the extracts from the early diaries comes a whole paragraph of notes of this kind :

Drops of rain hanging on rails etc. seen with only the lower rim lighted like nails (of fingers). Screws of brooks and twines ... Eyelids like leaves, petals, caps, tufted hats, handkerchiefs, sleeves, gloves. Also of the bones sleeved in flesh ... (p. 53).

Among the notes for February and March 1865 is the following :

Crocus candles yellow and white.

Notes for poetry. Feathery rows of young corn. Ruddy, furred and branchy tops of the elms backed by rolling cloud.



Frieze of sculpture long-membered vines tugged at by reaching pursuant fauns and lilies. (p. 41).

Another interesting note, shewing how alliterations shaped themselves in his mind, is:

Shapes of frozen snow-drifts. Parallel ribs. Delightful curves. Saddles, lips, leaves. (p. 40)

It is significant that the first example in the dialogue on the origin of beauty is a chestnut leaf.

Hopkins found it necessary to coin new words or twist or alter words from their accepted meanings to express his ideas and impressions — "inscape", "instress" and "idiom" are among the most vivid and the most important. He explains his use of "idiom" thus:

I have no other word yet for that which takes the eye or mind in a bold or effective sketching or in marked features or again in graphic writing, which not being beauty nor true inscape yet gives interest and makes ugliness even better than meaninglessness. (pp. 128-9)

"Inscape" is explained by Hopkins in a letter to Bridges (Febr. 15, 1879):

But as air, melody, is what strikes me most of all in music and design in painting, so design, pattern, or what I am in the habit of calling *inscape* is what I above all aim at in poetry. Now it is the virtue of inscape to be distinctive, and it is the vice of distinctiveness to become queer. This vice I cannot have escaped.<sup>1</sup>

Like most forceful users of language Hopkins was interested in it and often noted uses of words. The collection of Irishisms which he made for the *English Dialect Dictionary* has been lost, but scattered notes can be found in the *Journal*, though I have not compared them with the entries in the EDD.

Some mistakes in the MS might have been explained or corrected in the notes by the editor. On page 243 Hopkins mentions Icelandic verse and its rhymes, giving the Icelandic names *skothending* (assonance) and *aðalhending* (rhyme) as "shothending" and "ðalhending". In the second case Hopkins seems to have taken the initial -a- in *aðalhending* for the indefinite article. On page 7, in a *Note on water coming through a lock* the text has: "This turpid mass smooths itself as the distance increases from the lock". "Turpid" must be a misreading here for *turgid* or *turbid*, as a glance at the OED will shew.

Mr. House has done his work of editing well. His introduction, dealing with the MSS and their history, his invaluable notes and appendices, are all essential for the understanding of his texts. His last appendix, an extract from the *Catholic Encyclopedia* on the organisation of the Society of Jesus, is a thoughtful gift to non-Catholic readers, who have reason to be grateful for this easily accessible contribution to the study of Hopkins' environment. Above all we must be grateful for an admirable and well arranged index.

Anything that throws light upon the personality of Gerard Hopkins,

<sup>1</sup> G. M. Hopkins' *Letters to Robert Bridges*, ed. C. C. Abbott, Oxford 1935, p. 66; also quoted in G. F. Lahey, *Life of G. M. Hopkins*, Oxford 1930, p. 87, and in Bridges' edition of the *Poems*, p. 96-7.

that remarkable and pious man who has so captivated the imagination of an unreligious time, is of value. The note-books and papers which Mr. House has made accessible acquaint us with much which we should have been loth to have missed. The sermons and notes on Ignatius Loyola shew Hopkins from a new side and the jottings on natural scenes in the Journals will delight many who have treasured such touches in his poetry. For many his dazzling poetic technique has obscured his personality. This book should redress the balance effectively.

Basel-Cambridge.

LEONARD FORSTER.

## Bibliography

### HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM

#### (Nineteenth Century and After)

*Thomas De Quincey, a Biography.* By H. E. EATON. xiii + 542 pp. New York: Oxford University Press. London: Milford. 1936. 24s. net. [See Review, Aug. 1937.]

*Geschichtliches und Religiöses Denken bei Thomas de Quincey (1785-1859).* Von E. TH. SEHRT. (Neue deutsche Forschungen, Abt. Englische Philologie, Bd. 7.) 57 pp. Berlin: Junker & Dünhaupt. RM. 2.60.

*Mythology and the Romantic Tradition in English Poetry.* By DOUGLAS BUSH. Harvard University Press. London: Milford. 21s.

*The Decline and Fall of the Romantic Ideal.* By F. L. LUCAS. Cambridge University Press. 8s. 6d.

*Joseph de Maistre et l'Angleterre.* Par F. HOLDSWORTH. (Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature Comparée, 108.) x + 323 pp. Paris: Honoré Champion. 1936. [A review will appear.]

*Noah Webster, Pioneer of Learning.* By E. C. SHOEMAKER. xii + 347 pp. New York: Columbia University Press. London: Milford. 20s.

*The Lonely Wayfaring Man. Emerson and some Englishmen.* By TOWNSEND SCUDDER. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 10s. 6d.

*Evolution and Repentance.* Mixed Essays and Addresses on Aristotle, Plato, and Dante with Papers on Matthew Arnold and Wordsworth. By LANE COOPER. viii + 253 pp. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press. London: Milford. 10/6 net. [A review will appear.]

*Mark Twain's Notebook.* Prepared for Publication with Comments by ALBERT BIGELOW PAINE. Harper. 16s.

*Mark Twain: The Man and His Work.* By EDWARD WAGENKNECHT. Yale University Press. London: Milford. 13s. 6d.

*Mark Twain: Son of Missouri.* By MINNIE M. BRASHEAR. University of North Carolina Press. London: Milford. 13s. 6d.

*Mark Twain (Samuel Langhorne Clemens): Representative Selections with Introduction and Bibliography* by FRED LEWIS PATTEE. New York: American Book Company. \$1.00.

*Walt Whitman in Deutschland.* Von H. LAW-ROBERTSON. (Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie, XLII.) 91 pp. Giessen: von Münchowsche Universitätsdruckerei Otto Kindt GmbH. 3.20 M. [A review will appear.]

*Italian Influence on the Poetry of Tennyson.* By P. N. ROY. 76 pp. Benares: B. C. Banerjee, Uttara Press.

*The Fabulous Opera. A Study of Continuity in French and English Poetry of the Nineteenth Century.* By D. G. VAN DER VAT. 211 pp. Groningen: Wolters. 1936. f 3.90. [See Review, June 1937.]

Groningen diss.

*The History of the English Novel.* By E. A. BAKER. Vol. VII: The Age of Dickens and Thackeray. 404 pp. London: Witherby. 1936. 16s. net.

*The History of the English Novel.* By E. A. BAKER. Vol. VIII. From the Brontës to Meredith: Romanticism in the English Novel. Witherby. 1937. 16s.

*Persons and Places: Sources of Charlotte Brontë's Novels.* By HERBERT E. WROOT. The Brontë Society, Haworth Parsonage Museum, Yorkshire. 5s.

*Bild und Wirklichkeit bei Thomas Carlyle.* Eine Untersuchung des bildlichen Ausdrucks in Carlyles Sartor Resartus. Von L. ECKHOFF. (Schr. der Albertus-Univ. Geisteswiss. Reihe. Bd. 2.) viii + 187 pp. Königsberg: Ost-Europa Verlag. 1936. RM. 7,80.

*The Life of Charles Dickens.* By TH. WRIGHT. London: Jenkins. 18s.

*Early Victorian Drama 1830-1870.* By E. REYNOLDS. vii + 163 pp. Cambridge: Heffer & Sons. 1936. 6s. net. [A review will appear.]

*George Gissing, Classicist.* By S. V. GAPP. 210 pp. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. London: Milford. 9s. net.

*Presbyterian Pirate. A Portrait of Stevenson.* By D. N. DALGLISH. Oxford University Press. London: Milford. 8s. 6d.

*This Life I've Loved.* By ISOBEL FIELD. Michael Joseph. 15s.

*The Earnest Atheist. A Study of Samuel Butler.* By M. MUGGERIDGE. 260 pp. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$2.75.

*Charles M. Doughty: a Study of his Prose and Verse.* By A. TRENEER. London: Cape. 10s. 6d.

*The Note-Books and Papers of Gerard Manley Hopkins.* Edited with Notes and a Preface by H. HOUSE. xxxvi + 472 pp. Oxford University Press. London: Milford. 1937. 25s. net. [See Review.]

*Le Roman et les Idées en Angleterre. L'Anti-Intellectualisme et l'Esthétisme (1880-1900).* Par MADELEINE L. CAZAMIAN. (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, Fasc. 73.) 438 pp. Paris: Société d'Édition: Les Belles Lettres. 1935. 45 frs. [A review will appear.]

*Biologische Probleme in Thomas Hardy's Werk.* Von M. SCHUMACHER. 145 pp. Diss. Bonn. 1936.

*The Life of George Moore.* By JOSEPH HONE. Gollancz. 1936. 15s.

*Epitaph on George Moore.* By CH. MORGAN. London: Macmillan. 5s.

*As I Was Going Down Sackville Street.* By O. ST. J. GOGARTY. Richard and Cowan. 16s.

*Die Technik des Realistischen Dramas bei Ibsen und Galsworthy.* Von J. KRÖNER. (Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, herausg. von Max Förster. Heft XXVIII.) 113 pp. Leipzig: Tauchnitz. 1935. RM. 6.—. [See Review, Dec. 1936.]

*Der Mensch und die Gesellschaft im Werke John Galsworthys.* Von W. SCHMITZ. 199 pp. Diss. Köln; Bochum-Langendreer: Pöppinghaus.

*H. G. Wells' Verhältnis zum Darwinismus.* Von O. BARBER. (Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, XXVII.) 81 pp. Leipzig: Tauchnitz. 1934. [See Review, Dec. 1936.]

*H. G. Wells als Sozialreformer.* Von H. MATTICK. (Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, XXIX.) 176 pp. Leipzig: Tauchnitz. 1935. RM. 9.—. [See Review, Dec. 1936.]

*Arnold Bennett and his Novels.* By J. B. SIMONS. xv + 342 pp. Oxford: Blackwell. 1936. 12s. 6d. net. [See Review, Oct. 1936.]



## The Birth of Expressionism in the Work of D. H. Lawrence

Readers of D. H. Lawrence have sometimes expressed their regret that those qualities of warmth and fullness, of rich visualisation and intimate detail which characterise *The White Peacock* and *Sons and Lovers* as well as the early short stories should have disappeared from his later work. The same readers resent the hardness and vehemence of books like *Women in Love* and much of the later writings. These seem to them a falling-off from the achievements of the early Lawrence. Artistic gifts of the highest order had, in their eyes, been squandered in following a questionable impulse that led him into the desert of his later writings. The prophet had killed the artist.

No one who has read the later works can deny their artistic unevenness. Beside brilliant and inspired passages and powerful works like *The Ladybird*, *The Woman Who Rode Away* and *Glad Ghosts* there are others like *St. Mawr* and *The Princess* full of hasty and hard writing and crude incident. Whole novels, *Aaron's Rod* for example, seem to be written during an eclipse of the artistic powers. The qualities of solid workmanship that are continuously present in the earlier work — with *The Trespasser* as the only serious exception — are sacrificed to a spirit that comes and goes, and, though flawless and haunting passages may be found almost everywhere and in the most unexpected places, the rounded perfection of the whole is absent.

The early work of D. H. Lawrence, on the other hand, nowhere reveals that peculiar vision of the individual soul, for which Lawrence became famous and which exerted such a powerful influence over his contemporaries, and especially over the generation that followed him. This vision, though dimly foreshadowed in his earlier work, did not come to Lawrence in its fullness before 1912 and did not find full expression until the latter half of 1915. In 1915 *Sons and Lovers* had been in print for two years and the best of his early poetry and short fiction was already written. The disappearance of the early manner thus coincides with the full assertion of Lawrence's inward vision and conviction. The change of style is the necessary consequence, as it is also one of the most important manifestations of the spiritual evolution of an entirely new metaphysical outlook, a fundamental change of attitude to the problems of human existence, which cut him off from the old modes of feeling and thinking and made him reach out for new, not yet existing forms of expression.

In a number of works, some poetical and fictional, some abstract and metaphysical in character, D. H. Lawrence has set down a record of his experience and of his new vision. In these works may be found some of the earliest and most original English examples of what later on, on the Continent, came to be called expressionism, a term here used in its widest sense to cover all anti-realist as well as anti-idealist movements, irrespective of national and personal origin, reaching from Strindberg in the north to

Marinetti in the south and covering many "isms", of which the original "Expressionism" (applied in 1901 to groups of painters both in Paris and Germany) is but one of many forms.

The case of Lawrence is thus seen to be of European, and, incidentally, American, significance, as the influence exerted by Lawrence in later years was to show. Its primary interest, however, lies in the absolute originality and depth of his experience and the importance of the work created.

The intensely personal genius of D. H. Lawrence reveals itself in an uninterrupted series of only very thinly veiled autobiographical writings and still more directly in the rich body of letters published since his death. These enable us to make a close study of his development from year to year, and for certain crucial periods of his early life almost from month to month. Of no other writer of his generation or even of the generation before him do we possess so complete a series of writings<sup>1</sup> giving such full evidence of his personal life as of D. H. Lawrence. This is due to the publication of the *Letters of D. H. Lawrence* in 1932, with the Introduction by Aldous Huxley, which is the most catholic and penetrating study of Lawrence that has yet appeared; and of *Phoenix*, the collection of his Posthumous Papers edited by Edw. D. McDonald (1936). In addition to these two most important publications several early stories and plays that had either been out of print or unpublished before have lately been reissued [*Love Among the Haystacks* (1930), *A Modern Lover* (1934), *The Plays* (1933), *Last Cargo* (1935)].

### The Early Novels

To understand the nature of the change that comes over Lawrence in the last years before the war, the main features of his earlier work must be borne in mind. That work, while following in all its outer form and even in the interpretation of character and fate the accepted tradition of the Victorian novel, yet foreshadows and in an unconscious way expresses the intuitions that were to lead Lawrence to his revolutionary later work.

*The White Peacock*, his first novel, the "romantic idyll running to seed in realism", is a composite work, into the making of which the contrasting moods and artistic aspirations of at least two different phases of Lawrence's early career have gone. Its rural setting in the world of "Nethermere", and its rapturous descriptions of nature, as well as the intellectualism of its dialogue passages link it up with the *Richard Feverel* type of novel. It reflects the earliest phase of Lawrence's career as a writer, the phase of the earliest poems (P. 9-35), some of which have been drawn upon and incorporated in parts of the novel. (Compare *Love on the Farm* with the chapter *A Shadow in Spring*.) Part Three and certain additions to the earlier parts of the book, the Annable episode for instance, have received

<sup>1</sup> Works quoted :

1. *The Collected Poems of D. H. Lawrence*. Martin Secker, London. 1932. (P.)
2. *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*. Edited and with an Introduction by Aldous Huxley. Heinemann. 1934. (L.)
3. *Phoenix. The Posthumous Papers of D. H. Lawrence*. Edited and with an Introduction by Edward D. MacDonald. Heinemann. 1936. (Ph.)
4. *The Tales of D. H. Lawrence*. Martin Secker, 1934. (T.)
5. *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine and other Essays* by D. H. Lawrence. Martin Secker. 1934. (R.)

the imprint of the later, more troubled years of the author's youth, the years of his teaching at Croydon and of his experiments in London impressionism. Again, some of the poems of this time have been drawn upon for the description of Lettie's baby and of the Victoria Embankment (Part III, Ch. i, v). The dominant style of these parts is a hard, exasperated realism. Lawrence had been reading Maupassant, and the effect is seen in his description of Meg's household. These are the features that show the youthfulness of the author of *The White Peacock*.

The pervading lyricism of the book and some of its passages of nature description, the introductory sentence for instance, bear testimony to a permanent part of Lawrence's genius: his intuitive love of animal and flower life, his sense of the poignancy of existence amidst anguish and ecstasy. But this is as yet unrelated to human existence. There are comparatively few autobiographical features in *The White Peacock*. The description of Cyril's exile at Norwood is obviously a record of Lawrence's first impressions of his life at Croydon, but otherwise Lawrence has kept himself out of his book. What there is of him, in the person of Cyril, is tentative and does not come to life.

The note that may well be called prophetic in view of the later novels is to be found in the fate of George Saxton. *The White Peacock* is a tale of frustration and of the ultimate corruption of a soul. The reasons for this fate are as yet vague; beyond a sense of having failed in the ordeal of love, there is little to explain the fate of the hero and of his beloved. But the orchestration of that central event, by the parallel death of the old farm, the industrialisation of the countryside, the exiling of all the other figures of the story, is so powerful, that no doubt remains in the reader of the inevitability of the decline. A sense of the passing of youth fills the later pages of the book and lifts its crude detail into the lyrical movement of the rest. Fate, in the form of frustration and decay, is conceived, in a poetical spirit, as emotional, as yet undifferentiated personal feeling.

In *The Trespasser* the conventional as well as the personal features are intolerably and exclusively intensified. The conventional mould into which the emotional and physical unrest of this period of transition is cast, is of the crudest: adulterous love and suicide of the most sordid kind supply the machinery of the novel. Personal experience, the failure and surfeit of physical passion and the strain of the emotional relations that accompany it are represented with an obsessed and obsessive monotony. Nature, in her elemental aspects of sea and land, sun and moon, and time, in the sequence of hours and days, are entirely subservient to the moods of the lovers. The unison of outward and inward events, of setting and emotional life, unconscious in *The White Peacock*, is here overdone by conscious orchestration and continual reference to the music of *Tristan* and the *Ring*, in the spirit of which the whole is conceived. This story of an artist's martyrdom in love is Lawrence's tribute to the spirit of the Nineties, to the cult of great passions in the spirit of Art. Lawrence long withheld and never fully acknowledged this experiment in "intense" writing. Its contents were twice cast into the melting-pot before achieving final form in the second part of *The Rainbow*. In that form it was destined to appear as the first example of expressionist writing within the covers of a Lawrence novel. For this reason its evolution is of extraordinary interest for the study of the later manner. Something in the experience that lies behind



*The Trespasser* refused to go into the old moulds of writing, some crucial aspect demanded restatement until it found adequate expression. Hence the reappearance of the situation described in *The Trespasser* in the next novel *Sons and Lovers* and, ultimately, in *The Rainbow*.

In *Sons and Lovers* Lawrence reaches his full power. The transposition of personal experience into a fictitious setting, as we find it in the earlier novels, is now abandoned and experience is handled directly. Lawrence now turns to his own origin, to the mining world and the close, fertile intimacy of his own home with the powerful presences of his father and mother and his first love. The way to this acceptance of a more immediate reality had been prepared by certain short sketches and stories [*The Miner at Home* (Phoenix 775); *Strike Pay* (A Modern Lover); *Goose Fair* (T. 138); *Odour of Chrysanthemums* (ib. 184)]. The Eastwood of his shy, impressionable childhood, the object of a lifelong love turned into bitterness, and the scenes amidst which the awakening of his soul had taken place, give abundant food to his imagination, which, in this phase of his life, is never found at ease outside the range of his private experience. Lawrence's imagination is a kind of creative memory set free by the presence of emotional associations, most completely and powerfully where some dark, intimate warmth is spread by the mine, the kitchen, the inn or the fireside.

In the Nottinghamshire novels and stories these elements are all present. They dictate their own style of Realism, the style in which a generation of artists from Thomas Hardy to Arnold Bennett had rendered the overwhelming material presence of the earth on which they had been born and nurtured. Lawrence was deeply aware of these material forces; of the social order, the conditions of a miner's work and life, of the strange and excitable neighbourhood of the mine, side by side with the old farms and manor houses. His sense of these things was far more like Hardy's than Arnold Bennett's. The mine and the farm and the miner's cottage were magic presences to him, surrounded by fear and exultation, mixed with experiences of his childhood, never detached from the explosion of human temper, a volcanic world of unaccountable forces. Psychological and sociological laws might account for some of them, and Lawrence was very much alive to the sense of detached superiority that might be derived from such classification. In *The White Peacock* he had liked to comment on the workings of sex desire in the spirit of Schopenhauer, an early favourite of his, but once he has been overawed by the reality of such desire, the comment disappears and gives way to direct statement. In *Sons and Lovers* the ways of miners are minutely described, yet as soon as one of them comes near him, in the shape of his father, he grows into a Cyclopean figure of dark and uncertain outlines. *Sons and Lovers* thus is a colliery novel and as such in the line of *Clayhanger*, but in its essential features it defies the rules of the realistic novel, as Thomas Hardy's fiction does.

The difference is most apparent in the treatment of character, and there gives rise to a subtle conflict between intuitive, unconscious truth and conscious interpretation, far more significant than the similar discrepancies noted in the earlier novels. *Sons and Lovers* was conceived as a psychological novel. Its central *motif* is indicated in the title with its announcement of the tragic dilemma in which the hero is placed. According to that plan, the two most important figures in the book would have to be Mrs. Morel and Miriam. Both are indeed prominent throughout the book, but only one of them comes to life, the mother, whereas Miriam

impulse towards immediate, personal expression is spent. The later poems (*New Heaven and Earth*, *Elysium*, *Manifesto*, P. 325, 331, 333) and some of the earlier argumentative ones already (*Rose of all the World*, *Everlasting Flowers*, etc. P. 282, 284, 292, 295) mark the beginning of another process that is to dominate the coming years; the threefold process of creative expression of his new sense of "essential being" in works of art; the projection of this experience into abstract, symbolical prose; and the preaching of this life to his friends. These three activities go side by side, throughout the next few years. The conscious element is on the increase, but so is the inward certainty and power of expression and only in the very end, in the bitterness of momentary disillusion does it triumph over his art.

### The Symbolical Writings

For purposes of exposition it is advisable to deal with the theoretical and symbolical prose first, always remembering that in reality it is a less complete and less direct utterance than the prose of the novels and stories. In time and intention they go parallel, beginning at the same moment, but the growth of the novels is slower and more painful. As to the relation of abstract prose to fiction D. H. Lawrence in the preface to *Fantasia of the Unconscious* most emphatically proclaimed the priority of fiction over theory in every respect. To which one might add that even this theoretical, metaphysical prose was to Lawrence a spontaneous and necessary form of expression. The intellectual passion for abstract thought was his to no small degree. The strain of intellectualism and the love of generalisation in *The White Peacock* has been noted, and, similarly, the large space that passionate argument takes in *Sons and Lovers*. In both books, however, it is little more than an instrument serving secondary ends, not a part of direct expression itself.

It is otherwise in the writings that now follow. In these the creative as well as the critical intellect has a very large share and is part of the immediate expression. These writings are to a high degree abstract, non-representational. They are born of the great urge of creation and expression that is part of the genius of D. H. Lawrence in these later years. The difficulty of describing and expressing the immediate reality of essential being is great. Two of the metaphysical writings of this period, the draft of a *Foreword to "Sons and Lovers"* and the *Study of Thomas Hardy*, show him labouring to express his new insight. Both are only attempts and have remained unfinished.

The draft of a *Foreword to "Sons and Lovers"* of January 1913, is hardly more than a symptom of the beginning of a great process of crystallisation. It appears in the letters (L. 95) immediately after the first theoretical passage that contains an exposition of his ideas in the familiar words: "My great religion is a belief in the blood, the flesh as being wiser than the intellect..." (L. 94). The foreword expresses the same conviction in semi-mystical language borrowed from the Gospel of St. John; using the concept of the Trinity (The Father = the flesh, the Son = the Word, the Holy Ghost = the consummation of both in the revelation). Besides the attack on the Platonic idealism of the opening verses, which fills the first half of the text, one notes the passage: "And God the Father, the

Inscrutable, the Unknowable, we know in the Flesh, in Woman" (L. 100), wherewith Lawrence introduces the central theme of this and the next essay: the rebirth of man in the union with woman. The other passage to be noted is on the nature of this fulfilment given to man. "It is a moment of joy; of saying *I am I*", i.e. of self-expression. In the end Lawrence returns to the subject of *Sons and Lovers*, and, in a few final words, reviews his novel in the light of the metaphysical order into which everything is now projected. *Sons and Lovers* becomes in this Foreword a mystical formula. — One may dislike the style of this curious fragment, the heavy, apocalyptic tone and biblical phrasing, but even that is of interest, since it shows the powerful influence which a strict Nonconformist education had on D. H. Lawrence, especially in this sphere of his thought.

The *Study of Thomas Hardy* was written immediately after the outbreak of the war. In it Lawrence repeats and amplifies the argument of the *Foreword to "Sons and Lovers"*. The main idea, the duality of the sexes, however, is now expressed in a strange cosmological scheme into which D. H. Lawrence projects his personal experience. Again woman is to man the revelation of the infinite and absolute; *she* is at rest, *he* is "a raging activity, a thing of movement, time and change" (Ph. 446). Their union and balance, their relation, is happiness. Of this cosmic relation physical sex is only "an indication" and propagation is subordinated to the fulfilment of being, to the achievement of absolute individuality. Lawrence uses symbols to mark states of the soul and stages of its progress or corruption: the phoenix, the glow-worm, the lark, the poppy for "divine excess", "consummation in complete being", the cabbage for self-preservation and greed and "rotten safety". All these symbols reappear in *The Crown* and in many places of the later writings. With Thomas Hardy this fragment has as little to do as has the *Foreword to "Sons and Lovers"* with that novel itself. D. H. Lawrence, filled with the impulse to tell the truth that has been revealed to him, knows no obstacles or literary proprieties that could bind him to observe the rules of the game. Anything in heaven and on earth may serve as symbol to point to this truth and to show the dangers, and the abyss for which in his opinion the world is heading.

A sense of having to deliver a message fills him with increasing urgency, and a divine certainty (L. 237). The first sign of this appears in a letter to Edward Garnett of Feb. 1st, 1913. "I think, do you know, I have inside me a sort of answer to the *want* of to-day: to the real, deep want of the English people, not just what they fancy they want" (L. 105). Now in the first year of the war this impulse is stronger than ever and stirs him to enormous activity. After a winter spent "in the tomb" — winters were always difficult periods for Lawrence — there begins that year 1915 which is the *annus mirabilis* among the years of awakening and transition. In the course of this year Lawrence was to make his first attempt to put the dream of a new man, a new humanity into practice; in this year also he was to write down his "philosophy" in *The Crown*, the most mature of his metaphysical essays, and there was to be *The Rainbow*, as the first pure creation in prose in the new spirit.

In June 1914 the Lawrences had returned to England and had been making friends among the intelligentsia of the young generation. They had met John Middleton Murry and Katherine Mansfield as well as the Asquiths the year before during a short stay in England. Now they met Bertrand



Russell, Lady Ottoline Morrell, Catherine Carswell, Gilbert Cannan and a few others. To these most of the letters of 1915 are addressed. They are full of the hope of a new world. Lawrence has schemes of forming a colony, a community of pure, intrinsic individuals, somewhere away from Europe. Bertrand Russell is to help him to proclaim his new "religious belief, which leads to action" (L. 238, 239). The time for action has come. "I know what great work there is for us all to do in the autumn and onwards ..." (L. 239). The age-old instinct of preaching, of prosyletising, handed down to Lawrence through generations of dissenting spirits among his ancestors, and the impulse to express his new ideal combine in the dream of "the new unanimity, the new complete happiness beyond" (L. 301).

The essay which contains his "philosophy", *The Crown*, must be placed beside these other missionary activities of which it is an integral part. It was to win members for a future community that J. M. Murry, D. H. Lawrence and Katherine Mansfield combined to issue a periodical *The Signature*, and to hold meetings in a room in London. Lawrence wrote the six chapters that form *The Crown* between June and October 1915. Only three of them were printed, for the paper broke down after their publication.

*The Crown* is the most complete statement of the faith of D. H. Lawrence in terms of mystical symbolism. It says with great force and in magnificent language what Lawrence had been trying to express in his *Study of Thomas Hardy*.

Again the symbols are chosen with supreme unconcern. The Crown that lends the title is the crown of the royal English coat of arms. In the symbolism of this essay it plays the part which in the *Foreword to "Sons and Lovers"* is played by the Christian trinity. The lion and the unicorn that support the shield above which the crown is placed are symbols for the two opposite principles of the soul, "the living occupants of the immortal and mortal field" (R. 4). The history and quintessence of all existence is the fight of these two opposites. The lion stands for the principle of power, of darkness, of the beginning and source, of the senses, of self: the unicorn stands for light, the beginning, the mind, purity, love and selflessness. In the *Foreword to "Sons and Lovers"* these two opposing principles had been represented by God the Father, standing for the eternal flesh, and God the Son representing the word. The resemblance, however, is only very vague, for Lawrence has travelled a long way in the meantime. In the draft of 1913 the Word is subordinated to the Flesh, in *The Crown* the opposing principles are held in balance, and perfection is seen in "perfect opposition". "It is the perfect opposition of dark and light that brindles the tiger with gold flame and dark flame and drives his eyes to points of phosphorescence" (R. 12). "Consummation comes from perfect relatedness" (R. 17). This is the content of the first chapter. It is true that Lawrence always felt that in his time the balance was too much in favour of the end, the mind and the light, and that it was his task to redress it by insisting on the necessity of a vital connection with the sensual source of being. The way into darkness, the return to woman and the mysterious rebirth of the soul in that return will always be described in more glowing colours than the return to light. His genius gave Lawrence no choice in that direction, but his spiritual insight was such

that he saw the absolute duality. "My source and issue is in two eternities, ... but absolute is the rainbow, that goes between them, the iris of my very being" (R. 27).

The remaining chapters of *The Crown* are devoted to the corrupting processes, the dangers and aberrations of the soul. Only once, in the beginning of the third chapter, and again towards the end of the essay, does Lawrence return to his affirmation of the coexistence of the opposing forces. The one is a pæan sung to the diversity of life, of the diverse angels, the phoenix, the tiger and the dove; the other, forming the conclusion of the book, is devoted to the revelation of this perfect balance in "consummate being". Art is "the revelation of a pure, an absolute relation between the two eternities" and we get a glimpse of the nature of Lawrence's inspiration, when we read that "the poppy-flower is God come red out of the poppy plant" (R. 94). "Each creature, by some mystery, achieved a consummation in itself of all the wandering sky and sinking earth, and leaped into the other kingdom, where flowers are, of the gleaming ghost" (R. 94). — In such phrases Lawrence tries to define that higher being, that quintessential "being different" of the absolute individuality, "which is given to wild creatures in their spontaneity and should be man's". Fixation is bad, there must be no "tying the knot in Time" (R. 96). Memory is not truth. There is no revelation of God in memory. But wait, and then again we shall see God, and once more, it will be different."

If less rich and revealing, the negative parts of *The Crown* are powerful enough in their diagnosis of the *Flux of Corruption*; of analysis, science, introspection and the denial of duality by idealistic pantheism "the infinite with its tail in its mouth" (R. 28); the substitution of the impersonal relation by a barren egoistic one, symbolised by David (R. 30), and the savage outbreak against the material order of society: "There are no rich or poor, there are no masses and middle classes and aristocrats. There are myriads of framed gaps, people, and a few timeless fountains, men and women. That is all" (R. 41). Here too, Lawrence at times achieves the intensity of mystic vision in the creation of the symbols of corruption: the snake, the newt, the vulture, the dog and the baboon. "For the pure, absolute, the Holy Ghost lies also in the relationship, which is made manifest by the departure ... of the opposing elements" (R. 76).

The impulse from which the metaphysical writings sprang was so great at the time when Lawrence wrote *The Crown* that it set its imprint on all the other writings of that year. The Italian travel sketches of *Twilight in Italy* contain long passages that might be directly taken from *The Crown*. The very title of the book would seem to be symbolical and have to be brought into connection with a passage towards the end of *The Spinner and the Monks* in that book. All things take on symbolical significance and are assigned their places in the mystical drama of the passing of the soul from dark, powerful being to light and consciousness, or, more frequently still, from original integrity to present corruption.

The ideas of these two books also overflow into the *Letters*, which are full of outbreaks of an almost mystic faith. "One must put away all ordinary common sense, I think, and work only from the invisible world. The visible world is not true. The invisible world is true and real" (L. 259). Lawrence had reached absolute integration and full certainty in these later years of 1914 and 1915. But the great impulse is nearing its exhaustion.

remains a persistent, but vague and gentle presence. There is much reflection and argument in the passages connected with her, in which Lawrence does his utmost to explain Paul Morel's failure in his love for her. These passages supply the machinery of the novel. Now the failure was real enough, as will be seen, and so was probably his love; but the grim determinist belief, which was sincerely held by Lawrence, that his love for his mother and his love for Miriam were mutually exclusive and incompatible does not do justice to what his genius bade him write. The truly created part of the book is deeper and far richer and more hopeful than Lawrence makes it out to be. His theory scarcely fits Paul Morel's relations to Miriam, for he lays the blame too onesidedly on the girl, who is never allowed to exist apart from the hero. It fits still less the far more real Clara, round whom the drama of *The Trespasser* is re-enacted. Least of all does it fit with the character of the hero. Paul Morel is far from being the passive victim of a tragic dilemma. The sense of frustration, always present in Lawrence's characters, is with him as well, though his fate is wholly unlike George Saxton's in *The White Peacock*. It appears as the inevitable reaction of the contact with the outside world, of the shock sustained by the young soul on finding discord instead of harmony in its relation with other beings. Again it is a case of the passing of youth: a last trace of the emotional subjectivity of his earlier years that made Lawrence conceive as a final and inescapable dilemma,<sup>2</sup> what was in the reality of his own life and in the corresponding truth of his novel the birth-pang of his independent soul. It is the growth of that soul he is describing, and if psychological conceptions must be applied we should rather see successive phases of the awakening of love in Paul Morel's relations to his mother, to Miriam and to Clara. As types of the young soul's initiation they are of profound significance. But psychological analysis, although it takes such a prominent place within the book itself, is its least essential part. The figures and experiences described in *Sons and Lovers* have their independent value and existence as creations apart from comment.

The end of the novel describes Paul Morel, whose sensitive soul has been laid waste by the loss of his mother, unable to find any way out, despairing of his life. It is only his obstinate will that makes him hold on to life and escape the end which would have been more in keeping with his mood than is the suicide of Siegmund in *The Trespasser*. This end reflects a very real crisis in the life of D. H. Lawrence, for such was the mood that possessed him for many months after his mother's death in November 1910. Lawrence was in these months passing through the Valley of Death. The despair of any further rich fulfilment, expressed in the chapter entitled *Derelict*, was his own. We find it again in a number of poems written in this period (P. 123, 127, 130, 243). They are full of the thought of death. Desperate and naked eroticism alternates with moods of ennui and weariness. The titles alone tell the tale: *The Shadow of Death*, *In Trouble and Shame*, *Call into Death*, *Love Storm*. It is the atmosphere from which *The Trespasser* was born. The end of his love for "Miriam" falls within this period of "reduction to sensation", as Lawrence would have called it

---

<sup>2</sup> J. Middleton Murry is fully convinced of the final and incurable nature of this division in the real D. H. Lawrence, whom he blindly identifies with all the Lawrence heroes. Hence the disastrous argument of *Son of Woman*, that tantalising and revealing book of a rival prophet.



later on. Like many of the crises of his life it ended with an outbreak of his old lung trouble.

### Marriage and the New Vision

The severe attack of pneumonia in the winter of 1911, which put an end to his career as teacher, also wound up the long period of emotional instability and spiritual unrest that marks the close of the early life of D. H. Lawrence. The resulting peace and resignation is rendered beautifully in the *Hymn to Priapus* (P. 243). It was in this mood of blank and unearthly quiet that D. H. Lawrence met his future wife.

A great change then set in, which can be traced in the poems written in the summer of 1912, when Lawrence was staying in Bavaria and in Italy. These poems proclaim with steadily increasing insistence that his life had at last been fulfilled, that his soul had found its centre and been made whole by the woman in whom he had found the source of his being, who was his mate and equal. The marriage with Frieda von Richthofen (for marriage it was in the deepest sense, although it was not legalised until 1914) is the decisive event in the life of D. H. Lawrence. In that summer of 1912 and the months that followed Lawrence came into himself. His long-protracted and painful youth was ended and his manhood established. But the influence of that event does not end there. Just as previous crises in his life had produced a turmoil of new ideas and had been impulses towards creative expression, this greatest and final experience becomes the origin of a far-reaching spiritual change, the change that brings about the birth of expressionism.

The process of crystallisation sets in very early and covers a long period. It is not till four and a half years afterwards in the bitter war-winter of 1916/17, that the movement begun in spring 1912 may be said to have found its extreme conclusion in *Women in Love*. The course of his outward life and the sequence of his moods, the plans and ideas that occupy D. H. Lawrence at this time may be followed in the *Letters*, of which they form the richest and most intimate part (L. 35-388). Lawrence never wrote finer and more generous letters than in these years. Many of them throw gleams into the working of his mind; he mentions the growth of novels and stories and gives an occasional exposé of his "philosophy". But the inner, organic growth of his mind, the transformation of experience into creative thought and vision, the shaping of these visions in the successive versions of the novels, and, lastly, the process of the formation of abstract thought are so mysterious and continuous in this period that it is impossible to do more than guess and follow at a great distance and to mark a few outstanding features and results. The intensity of D. H. Lawrence's inward life, the ground covered by his spirit and the fullness and sincerity of his slow and powerful development is astonishing to the highest degree.

The literary documents of this great transition, besides the letters already mentioned, are the following, here given in chronological order. I. The poems of *Look! We Have Come Through!*, most of them written in 1912/13. II. Two short stories entitled *The Prussian Officer* and *The Thorn in the Flesh* written in the early summer of 1913. III. The draft of a *Foreword for "Sons and Lovers"* written in January 1913 (L. 95) leading up to a *Study of Thomas Hardy* written in autumn 1914 (Ph. 398),

both of which remained fragments and preparations for *The Crown* (see V.). IV. *The Rainbow*, written in 1913/14, published in September 1915. V. *The Crown* written and published in autumn 1915, intimately connected with parts of VI: *Twilight in Italy*, written at the same time and published in June 1916. VII. *Women in Love*, planned and written in a first draft as early as 1913, published version written 1916, first (private) publication 1920.

For purposes of analysis two phases may be distinguished: an earlier one, stretching from 1912 to 1914, which may again be subdivided into the time before 1913, during which the purely personal issue dominates over everything, the time of the poems; and the year 1913, the year of tentative effort, of slow crystallisation and generalisation. During this first phase Lawrence still occasionally harks back to his past and uses older forms of expression.

The later phase covers the years 1914-1916, during which Lawrence finished *The Rainbow* and wrote *The Crown*, containing the most complete announcement of his new belief, and finally drafted *Women in Love*. All these works and the other attempts of Lawrence to influence the world in the new spirit were stillborn, amidst a world absorbed by the war.

### The Assertion of the New Individuality *The Poems*

The first result of the change is the assertion of a new type of individual being. Its growth may be followed through the first half of *Look! We Have Come Through!* To D. H. Lawrence the experience of the fulfilment of his manhood through love must have been almost mystical in depth. It was to him the revelation of a new, unknown mode of life. Here was a rebirth of his soul and body into greater life, and this after everything had seemed to be at an end! Suddenly the old entanglements, the navel-string that had bound him to his mother, the divided love-and-friendship, the weariness and emptiness, had disappeared. He was released, newborn.

I am myself at last. Now I achieve  
My very self. I, with the wonder mellow  
Full of fine warmth, I issue forth in clear  
And single me, perfected from my fellow.

(P. 271.)

It was the result of this new relation which had brought him deep and complete fulfilment, sexual fulfilment above all, which henceforth is looked upon as the test of all life. In all the earlier loves his soul and body had been spent. now they were collected and reborn in perfect consummation. His joy over this is expressed in the first two poems of the new cycle *Bei Hennef* (P. 250) and *The First Morning* (P. 251). But there is struggle and suffering in this new life, too. Both poems hint at it and there are others that describe the strife in love in all its phases. At first it is the fight with the past life in oneself (P. 251/2) and in the partner of this love (P. 253. 262); then, still more serious, the fight with the obstinate individual being, its pride and egoism. In such struggles the old self is purged away and the new being, so delicate and precarious at first, is strengthened and assumes confidence. The growth of its certainty is seen in the pride of its assertion, in the face of its partner, of God and the world. The last

step, which leads to what we have called the second phase of the spiritual progress, is its open proclamation in ever louder tone in poems that take the form of manifestos (P. 315).

What is the nature of this new sense of individual existence? It may best be seen in its expression, expressiveness being one of its peculiar features. One of the first of the Bavarian poems ends like this:

The mountains are balanced,  
The dandelion seeds stay half-submerged in the grass;  
You and I together  
We hold them proud and blithe  
On our love.  
They stand upright on our love,  
Everything starts from us,  
We are the source.

*First Morning* (P. 251)

The last three lines express the new way of looking at things. Things no longer exist apart, in material presence, as they do to the impressionist, who catches them in their momentary glitter, their evanescent appearance as visible surface and play of light. Lawrence's dandelion seed lives in unison with the poet and his love. It is not the seed-bubble with its fluffy airiness, that might have delighted the eye of the impressionist, or the luscious leaves, or any other part, but the total being of the plant in its vitality, which is intuitively divined as force, like the mountains, upheld "in balance". The core of the poet's being is the source of this life, he is the pole and centre which stands in relation to all things and in whom all things are centred.

A great urge of being, a sense of being borne up by powerful life fills the poet and instils everything with richer life, of which he is the spontaneous and mysterious source. Lawrence elsewhere calls this urge of life within him "the flame"<sup>3</sup> or "the spark of life", "the essential being". It is elemental life, that had revealed itself to Lawrence in its fulness through sexual fulfilment and it never loses the connection with this source throughout all its changes. In its purity, in the years when it slowly dawned upon the poet<sup>4</sup> and the years of the first triumphant revelation it is shy and wild, a quality, which, alas, soon wore off with abstract handling and passionate reiteration. To Lawrence it was the secret of what he called individuality, being different, independent, proud, unquenchable.

Now he has achieved such essential being himself. The unbroken, proletarian genius has triumphed over the world. The time of his "coming-through", if dates must be given, is somewhere towards the end of 1912. In 1913 the personal poems become scarce and cease altogether. The

<sup>3</sup> See the passage in L. 94. 17 Jan. 1913. To Ernest Collings.

<sup>4</sup> In some of the early short stories: *Odour of Chrysanthemums*, *The Daughters of the Vicar*, *The White Stocking*, and in passages of the novels, this elemental core of being is discovered in the presence of death, or of the powers of sex. The figure of Annable is an attempt at expressing essential male life. Shortly after the crisis of manhood described above (in June and July, 1913) Lawrence wrote the two short stories that appear at the head of the *Collected Tales: The Prussian Officer* and *The Thorn in the Flesh*. In both, essential manhood in the crude form of the underdog's sullen hatred, takes vengeance for its humiliation in explosive and melodramatic action. Both stories are interesting as early examples of expressionist fiction. The much finer *Love among the Haystacks*, written at the same time, shows similar features in a setting reminiscent of *The White Peacock*.



One after another of the schemes for the foundation of a colony falls through. Bertrand Russell, who was to share the venture of the *Signature*, disagrees. There is a quarrel. Murry, incurably personal, refuses to believe in an impersonal conception of the new freedom; and Lawrence himself, if we must believe the note he wrote in 1925 for the reprint of *The Crown*, never believed in "doing things", i.e., in issuing manifestoes and holding lectures. The letters, however, prove that once at least, in the spring of 1915, he was full of hope and was ready to act. Disillusion came speedily enough. The first real war-winter of 1915/16 sets in with air-raids — "our world is gone, and we are like dust in the air" (L. 253). The real gloom descends when Lawrence returns to his native Midlands to spend Christmas with his sister. The thought of his childhood and youth is painful to him: "It is a cruel thing to go back to the past" (L. 300). "The strange, dark, sensual life" of the Midlands, "so violent, and hopeless at the bottom, combined with this horrible paucity and materialism of mental consciousness, makes me so sad, I could scream" (L. 300).

In December 1915 the Lawrences move to Cornwall. Lawrence has given up all hope of finding complete fellowship among men. "I've done bothering about the world and people — I've finished" (L. 305). A great bitterness invades him. The letters record more and more his dislikes and disappointments only. "The world crackles and busts," but "one has a certain order inviolable in one's soul" (L. 347). Lawrence, after the failure of his plans, still goes on in *one* activity, the writing of his novels and stories, and to this, as the most important and most complete expression, we must now turn; realising that, with D. H. Lawrence, symbolical and theoretical statement is an episode only, while artistic creation is permanent.

### The Novels

It was not the story-teller's impulse that drove Lawrence to write his novels. The limitation of his faculty of invention has been noted above. There was something else in him, equally strong and undeniable, that made for expression in prose fiction. It was his way of experiencing life and hence of imagining experience in others. His mode of experiencing life is eminently active and in a peculiar way what one might call *cyclical*. This peculiarity of his is best seen when it expresses itself in a medium that is not fictional — in poetry for instance. One notices here, and the poems of *Look! We Have Come Through!* are a good example, that the single poem is not complete, self-contained, but requires elucidation from its fellows before and after. Lawrence was aware of this difficulty. In the foreword to the original 1917 edition of *Look! We Have Come Through!* he says: "These poems should not be considered separately, as so many single pieces. They are intended as an essential story, or history, confession, unfolding one from the other in organic development; the whole revealing the intrinsic experience of a man during the crisis of manhood, when he marries and comes into himself", and in the note to the *Collected Poems* of 1928 we read: "Many of the poems are so personal that, in their fragmentary fashion, they make up a biography of an emotional and inner life" (P. v). The poetry of D. H. Lawrence is, in other words, on the way to the "essential story", and the above description of its character might equally well serve as definition of the typical Lawrence novel. The same might be shown to

be the case with the metaphysical writings. They are mystical epics in the making; *The Crown* might be compared to Blake's *First Book of Urizen*, or again, divested of its symbolism, to certain parts of *The Rainbow* or *Women in Love*.

The cycles in which his emotional experience moves consist of the contrasting moods in which every inward event finds successive expression — on the metaphysical plane they correspond to the passage of the soul from darkness to light and back again.<sup>5</sup>

Fiction, then, was the fundamental expression of Lawrence's genius. When the spiritual change, which has been described above, was completed (towards the end of 1912), the first plans of a new novel appear.<sup>6</sup>

The growth of this new novel, which later on developed into two separate halves, *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*, is difficult to follow, in spite of continual references to it in the letters to the friend and literary adviser Edward Garnett. The development seems to have been on the following lines: Lawrence first (Jan. 1913) thought of and wrote a draft of a novel, called *The Sisters*, dealing with the relation of woman to man (L. 105, 111, 112). This early draft roughly corresponded to the later *Women in Love*. About the same time Lawrence also started writing *The Insurrection of Miss Houghton*, which later on became *The Lost Girl*. The autumn and winter of 1913 was spent in work on *The Sisters*, the beginning of which is greatly expanded by a prelude that soon grew into a separate novel, called *The Wedding Ring*. After many revisions, Lawrence, in May 1914, added the last, symbolical chapter to *The Wedding Ring*, and changed its title into *The Rainbow*. As such it was published in September 1915. *The Sisters*, the original novel, had to wait three years for its completion (in June 1916) and another four years for its first (private) publication (in 1920).

*The Rainbow* is the most interesting of all Lawrence novels from the point of view of style, for on a closer study one discovers that it is written in two manners, the first five chapters being a late example of the early, representational style, while the second half is non-representational in character and increasingly symbolical towards the end. There is no evidence in the *Letters* of the reasons for this change, but it is none the less evident. What the *Letters* do give is a series of highly illuminating comments on the nature of this new work. Most of them apply to the early, unknown draft of *The Sisters*, and are addressed to Edward Garnett. The following are the most important passages, in the light of which we shall have to read *The Rainbow*. "... 100 pages of a novel. It is quite different in manner from my other stuff — far less visualised (L. 105). ... all crude as yet ... a stratum deeper than I think anybody has ever gone in a novel ... all analytical — quite unlike *Sons and Lovers*, not a bit visualised (L. 111) ... much quieter. I shall not write quite so violently as *Sons and*

<sup>5</sup> The duality of the opposing principles of the soul is no mere construction, but was actually experienced by Lawrence in successive phases of feeling throughout his life. Every change of scene, every decisive event of his life, started such a cycle, and it may be that Lawrence was following this law of his existence when later on in life he moved from continent to continent, driven by the need of his soul as much as by that of his health, which in some mysterious way seems to have been in unison with it.

<sup>6</sup> Up to then Lawrence had been revising and rewriting *Sons and Lovers*, as well as some early short stories besides writing dramas, *The Widowing of Mrs. Holroyd* etc., all of which belong to his earlier life.

*Lovers* any more (L. 174)." Then, in an important letter (L. 177), in answer to Edward Garnett's adverse comment on *The Sisters*: "I have no longer the joy in creating vivid scenes that I had in *Sons and Lovers*. I don't care much more about accumulating objects in the powerful light of emotion." In the midst of these technical discussions, we read the confession: "I am going through a transition stage myself ... It is not so easy for one to be married. In marriage one must become something else" — and of the book again: "it is the vaguer result of transition. I write with everything vague — very beautiful, but it may not be sufficiently incorporated to please you" (L. 178). And after still more serious criticism on the part of his friend, Lawrence answers more seriously still: "All the time, underneath, there is something deep evolving itself out of me. And it is *hard* to express a new thing, in sincerity. ... My novels must be written from the depth of my religious experience. That I must keep to, because I can only work like that" (L. 190).

If, with these statements in mind, we open *The Rainbow*,<sup>7</sup> we are surprised to find that the vivid scenes, the fully visualised world, the accumulated objects and the strong emotion are still there. *The Rainbow* opens, exactly like *Sons and Lovers*, with the description of a corner of Nottinghamshire, giving in the compass of a single page the economic and social history, the structure and aspect of the countryside. What follows is the chronicle of the Brangwen family at the Marsh Farm, the wooing, wedding, and married life of two generations of farmers. Each generation comes from the warm native earth into the supreme adventure of love, in which it meets a foreign, different world, represented by the Polish lady of Tom Brangwen, the Anna Lensky of Will Brangwen and the Anton Skrebensky of Ursula. There is in the first half a calm and composed rhythm of desire and fulfilment, culminating in the wedding of Anna with Will Brangwen. Love, when it comes to the men and women of the first chapters of the book, comes as an overawing lord of the soul and is borne and suffered in silence until it finds its release. The atmosphere is that of the finest of the early short stories: of the second part of *The Daughters of the Vicar*, for example. The writing is quieter. The acute and haunting sharpness of sensation which Lawrence, remembering the agonies of his childhood, had given to *Sons and Lovers*, is absent here. It is true that these early chapters of *The Rainbow* also show many signs of the new conception of life. The place assigned to the two sexes in the world of the Marsh Farm reminds one of the passage on the duality of the sexes in the symbolical essays; and there is a description (Rb. 45) of the passing into darkness and oblivion, and another, still more definite one, of the rebirth through sexual consummation (Rb. 92/94). But these elemental experiences are so fully "incorporated" and surrounded by a visible world so fully and lovingly described that the framework of the traditional novel is not broken by them. As in that novel the outside world rests on its own foundations and is allowed to exist apart, and even to develop its atmosphere. The laws of this world: of inheritance, social order and growth in time are unquestioned and stable. The foreign beings that enter it and bring prophetic tidings of another existence, the Polish members of the Brangwen clan, accept them, dwelling apart in their own "otherness".

<sup>7</sup> I quote from the unexpurgated Albatross edition of *The Rainbow* 1934 (Rb).



It is different with the later chapters of the book (Rb. vi-xvi). As soon as the doors of the little cottage where Will Brangwen and Anna are to spend their honeymoon are closed on the night of their wedding, the visible world begins to dissolve before a more intense, inward world unfolding itself in the passionate experience of husband and wife. It is now that the "essential story, or history, confession" unfolds itself, "revealing intrinsic experience" viz. that absolute duality of the sexes, of which Lawrence writes in his symbolical essays. In *Anna Victrix* (Rb. 139) the poems of *Look! We Have Come Through!*, turned into passionate prose, achieve the form to which they aspire: the complete cycle of inward biography. In the face of this elemental life, the realities of the earlier chapters cease to matter: the family with its spirit, inherited and bred, the farm with its material fullness and fertility, the play of character in the manifold relations of brothers and sisters, that whole world in which Lawrence moves with such ease in the beginning of the book is obliterated. What remains are "essential beings", divested of all attributes of society, free from any relation that might bind them to the world; beings that are archetypes of life: man, woman and child. These henceforth carry their own fate, even their own climate, time and space about inside them. When the cycle of the union and assertion of Will and Anna is exhausted "the widening circle" begins, with Ursula as the centre, round whom the rest of the novel turns. With Ursula as heroine, and the reminiscences of his own experiences as a young teacher at Eastwood and as a student at Nottingham as material, D. H. Lawrence rewrites *Sons and Lovers* in the new spirit, and in expressionist style. The beautiful intimate passages, the homely dialect, the full grasp on material circumstance disappear, and instead of this there is a vehement style full of abstract terms. What is worked out in "vivid scenes" in the beginning of the book is now stated in a kind of mental shorthand or ideograph: "The body of love was killed in her after Winifred" (Rb. 346); "the air of hostility and disintegration, of wills working in antagonistic subordination, was hideous" (Rb. 369); and: "It was bliss, it was the nucleolating of the fecund darkness" (Rb. 433). If the defect of the old style had been a certain "flippant and often vulgar" impressionism, the new one produces vehement, often almost maniacal reiteration, a hammering in of hard judgements in equally hard and harsh words.

Ursula lives through all those experiences of her creator that he had not yet incorporated into a novel, and in addition to these, she is made to pass through the experience of Helen in *The Trespasser*, which here appears for the third time. Miriam and Mrs. Morel, the rival heroines of *Sons and Lovers*, have no counterparts in this novel. The division they had caused in Lawrence has been healed, but the ghost of that other love, of the episode with Helen in *The Trespasser* and with Clara in *Sons and Lovers*, was not yet laid. It reappears in a new metamorphosis — seen at greater distance this time; with the last signs of autobiographical confession removed.<sup>8</sup> And at last the riddle is solved. It was not the surfeit and

---

<sup>8</sup> This recurrence of the theme of *The Trespasser* in expressionist form is highly significant as showing the intimate connection between the spirit of the Nineties (in which *The Trespasser* was conceived) and that of the early phases of expressionism. Both movements are individualist and subjective in the extreme and favour an experimental

dissatisfaction of sensual experience, or the presence of other ties, of rivals, as with Clara, but the absence of the "flame of life" in Skrebensky that causes the failure. Lawrence had not been ready for full existence when he had gone through the bitter ordeal of that frustrated love. He had been "annihilated" then, as before with Miriam. Skrebensky cannot be reborn — so he is doomed to nonentity<sup>9</sup>. Ursula, on the other hand, is the being with the "spark of life", and *The Rainbow* shows, in the words of Lawrence, "woman becoming individual, self-responsible, taking her own initiative" (L. 190). The metal of her being is tested and hardened in contact with "the world of man" and then serves as a test and ordeal for those that enter into relation with her.

Lawrence has at last discovered the true meaning of his early life: it was the development of individuality.

One last concession to the world of time and relativity is made in *The Rainbow* — in acknowledging the fact of development, of growth in time.

In the next novel, *Women in Love*, that last traditional element disappears too. The figures that move through its pages are from the beginning irrevocably fixed in their fate. They either exist, or do not exist, essentially. The situations that Lawrence imagines for them are symbolical, like the situations of a morality-play, and show the passage of the soul from the Flux of Corruption, the Reduction to Sensation (in the relation of Birkin to Hermione Roddice), to Rebirth or Annihilation. The leading issues are threshed out remorselessly in the discussions of the people in the novel. *Women in Love* is a great step further towards abstract art. It represents the most extreme expression of the new vision in creative work that Lawrence achieved at this time of his life. We have to wait till 1926, when *The Plumed Serpent* appeared, for a similar summing-up of his conception of life in terms of fiction. *Women in Love* is unique in another respect as well: it is practically free from autobiographical features, showing thus how far removed it is from immediate experience. The effect of this distance and of the powerful work of abstraction that had gone to its making is severely chilling. The disillusion and bitterness of the war years during which *Women in Love* was written added the final note of savage pessimism. The icy slope down which Gerald Crich falls to death is in the neighbourhood of Marienhütte in the Tyrol, where D. H. Lawrence passed in the summer of 1912, at the height of his first new-found happiness.

The great cycle is closed. The end in absolute light of knowledge and utmost abstraction has been reached. There follows a year of ill-health and despair, 1918, and then the new cycle sets in with the year 1919. Its first signs are the fascinating end of *The Lost Girl* with the passage of Alvina through war-time France to Italy, and the Tuscan and Sicilian poems of *Birds, Beasts and Flowers*. These correspond to *Look! We Have Come Through!* The tracts on Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious carry the message of *The Crown* a stage further, and the novels of this period,

---

conception of art and life; both develop forms of great intensity that appear as "blind alleys" to traditionalist criticism. The point of contact is apparent also in the work of Ezra Pound, in the early work of T. S. Eliot and, less obviously, in *Ulysses*.

<sup>9</sup> At about the same time Lawrence creates another figure of extinct manhood in the *Egbert of England, My England* (T. 203).

*Aaron's Rod* and *Kangaroo*, lead up to *The Plumed Serpent*. Then comes the descent again to *Nettles*, *Pansies*. The fundamental conceptions, however, are those born of the first, pre-war experience, which remains the decisive turning-point in the life of D. H. Lawrence.

### Lawrence and Expressionism

The connection of the term Expressionism with D. H. Lawrence may at first sight look somewhat strange.<sup>10</sup> Hitherto this term, if it has been applied to English writers at all, has been associated with authors like James Joyce, the Sitwells<sup>11</sup> or T. S. Eliot. The reason for this lies in the origin of the term. It was coined in an atmosphere of, and in connection with, analytical and strongly intellectualist art and is often associated with certain devices and mannerisms of experimental art. There is, however, a profound and vital connection between the serious work of these writers and other manifestations of widely different formal characteristics, but essentially similar attitude to the main issues. In a number of works of art, created in the first decade of our century and later, the "joy in vivid scenes", i.e., in the representation of the outside world, is absent. Its place is taken by the impulse to present, directly and indirectly, states of the individual soul; to project a powerful, spontaneous, often explosive inward life into the universe, deforming in that process the conventional shape of things in the attempt to give them an essential one. This art, by the nature of its inspiration, approached the sphere of mysticism and religion, and for the same reason favoured the lyrical and dramatic form.

I do not propose to discuss whether the nature of D. H. Lawrence's work is compatible with this or that definition of Expressionism. The term is here applied to the spiritual attitude as a whole, irrespective of form. Of such expressionism he certainly is an important witness, as will have been seen from his writings.

As further proof of this the attitude of D. H. Lawrence to other well-known forms of early expressionism in literature and painting may be mentioned here. When writing *The Rainbow* Lawrence came across the manifestoes and poetry of the Italian futurists Marinetti and Paolo Buzzi. In a highly interesting letter (L. 195/196) he explains his attitude to futurism: "I have been interested in the futurists ... I like it because it is the applying to emotions of the purging of the old forms and sentimentalities ... but I don't agree with them as to the cure and the escape. They will progress down the purely male or intellectual, or scientific line ... It is all ultra-intellectual, going beyond Maeterlinck and the Symbolistes, who are intellectual."

And about *The Rainbow* Lawrence writes in the next letter (L. 198):

<sup>10</sup> It has been established before this in a valuable doctor's thesis by Wilhelm Reichwagen: *Der expressionistische Zug im neuesten englischen Roman*. Greifswald, 1931. The first part of his thesis is based on C. W. L. Dahlström's book on Strindberg's dramatic Expressionism, in which the German theories of Expressionism are summed up. Comparison with French literature — Rimbaud, J. Romains, Léon-Paul Fargue etc. — would probably prove equally, if not more, revealing.

H. Wesslau, *Der Pessimismus bei D. H. Lawrence*, 1931, is another Greifswald study of L. in which the expressionist features are pointed out.

<sup>11</sup> See Bernhard Fehr, "Expressionismus in der neuesten englischen Lyrik." *Festschrift für Max Förster*. Tauchnitz 1929. P. 267 ff.



"I think the book is a bit futuristic — quite unconsciously so. But when I read Marinetti 'The profound intuitions of life added one to the other, word by word, according to their illogical conception will give us the general lines of an intuitive physiology of matter' I see something of what I am after" — "that which is physic — non-human, in humanity, is more interesting to me than the old-fashioned human element"; "I don't care what the Woman *feels* — in the ordinary usage of the word. I only care what the woman *is* ... as a phenomenon or as representing some greater, inhuman will." — "There is another *ego*, according to whose action the individual is unrecognisable and passes through, as it were, allotropic states ... like as diamond and coal are the same pure single element of carbon. The ordinary novel would trace the history of the diamond — but I say, 'Diamond! What! This is carbon' — my theme is carbon."

Lastly a quotation from a letter dealing with the art of the eminent English painter Duncan Grant, whom he had met (L. 215): "I like Duncan Grant very much. ... Tell him not to make silly experiments in the futuristic line — other Johnnies can do that. It is an *Absolute* we are all after, a statement of the whole scheme — the issue, the progress through time — and the return — making unchangeable eternity."

This makes his attitude to the mannerisms of experimentalists and dilettanti abundantly clear — as well as his own conception. But in spite of all criticism of details D. H. Lawrence is with the Expressionists in the main issues — as the Romantic of English expressionism to the Classicist in T. S. Eliot and the analytical genius of James Joyce.

St. Gallen.

MAX WILDI.

## Notes and News

### Lucio, in *Measure for Measure*

Lucio appears in all five acts of Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure*, and speaks almost three hundred lines;<sup>1</sup> he summons Isabella to the aid of her imprisoned brother; he slanders the Duke of Vienna to his face; and his final discomfiture and punishment add a comic touch to the dénouement. Moreover, John Lowin, who also played such important roles as Claudius, Falstaff, and Iago, acted the part in 1604;<sup>2</sup> and, furthermore, because Lucio is Shakespeare's own creation, and has no prototype in Whetstone's *Promos and Cassandra*, the dramatist must have considered him significant. Critics, however, have contributed merely casual remarks to the interpretation of his character. According to Ulrici, Lucio "is both vicious and voluptuous through frivolity... without being intentionally wicked."<sup>3</sup> Clark describes him as a "socially esteemed 'gentleman' ... tainted with fashionable vices"

<sup>1</sup> References are to the William Aldis Wright edition of Shakespeare's plays.

<sup>2</sup> T. W. Baldwin, *The Organization of Shakespeare's Company*, Princeton, 1927, Plate III.

<sup>3</sup> H. Ulrici, *Shakespeare's dramatische Kunst*, 1836, tr. Schmitz, London, 1876, II, p. 161.

who "frequents genteel society."<sup>4</sup> Gervinus condemns him altogether as a "light-minded calumniator," an "infamous slanderer," an "incorrigible man," and groups him in one breath with Pompey, the bawd.<sup>5</sup> Quiller-Couch refers to "insufferable Lucio ambling up and down to turn the whole affair into 'comedy' in spite of itself."<sup>6</sup> Draper mentions his "petty lies and slanders,"<sup>7</sup> and Raspin, "l'insouciant et cynique dépravation"<sup>8</sup> of Lucio. Lawrence remarks that Falstaff and Lucio are "gentlemen gone wrong,"<sup>9</sup> and speaks of "impudent, dissolute, engaging Lucio," whose "taste for scandal" is "a mere luxury of idleness."<sup>10</sup> He adds that Froth and Lucio, though of better social station, are fit to be grouped with Elbow, Pompey, and Abhorson.<sup>11</sup> To critics, then, Lucio is a gentleman, engaging but unprincipled. The present study proposes to consider in the light of Elizabethan life his rank, his morals, and his behavior.

In social status, Lucio is a gentleman;<sup>12</sup> but he is certainly not, as he pretends, a courtier; for, though he boasts that he knows the supposedly absent Duke,<sup>13</sup> and "was an inward of his,"<sup>14</sup> yet the Duke does not know even his name.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, Lucio seems to know no one of consequence but Claudio, and apparently moves chiefly in the underworld. If he has a profession, it must be arms;<sup>16</sup> and, whatever his means, he lives beyond them.<sup>17</sup> He would seem to be one of that numerous group of "simple gentlemen"<sup>18</sup> whom the Tudors "made good cheap in England,"<sup>19</sup> and who, swaggering, boastful, finely-dressed,<sup>20</sup> affected Italianate manners learned from courtesy books,<sup>21</sup> and "haunted Paul's and pretended to have seen the world."<sup>22</sup> Such a one "maintained his reputation by naming great men

<sup>4</sup> C. C. Clark, *Shakespeare's Characters*, London, 1863, p. 503.

<sup>5</sup> G. G. Gervinus, *Shakespeare Commentaries*, tr. Bunnett, London, 1892, p. 487.

<sup>6</sup> J. D. Wilson and A. D. Quiller-Couch ed. *Meas. for Meas.*, Cambridge, 1922, p. xlii.

<sup>7</sup> J. W. Draper, "Political Themes in Shakespeare's Later Plays," *J. E. G. Ph.*, XXXV, p. 84.

<sup>8</sup> René Raspin, "Mesure pour Mesure," *Rev. Anglo-amér.*, VIII, p. 45.

<sup>9</sup> W. W. Lawrence, *Shakespeare's Problem Comedies*, New York, 1931, p. 66.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 109.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 119.

<sup>12</sup> I, ii, *passim*; III, ii, 67; V, i, 84, 146.

<sup>13</sup> III, ii, 139.

<sup>14</sup> III, ii, 122.

<sup>15</sup> III, ii, 147, ff.

<sup>16</sup> The "two gentlemen" with whom Lucio makes his initial appearance are either soldiers or are pretending to be such, but we cannot know whether the phrase "not a soldier of us all" is meant to include Lucio. If he has ever been a soldier, the age of his child (III, ii, 189), and his arrest on a paternity charge (IV, iii, 164 ff.) indicate that he has not been to war for at least two years. For men pretending to military experience in order to win a reputation for bravery, see Thomas Nashe, *Works*, ed. McKerrow, London, 1910, p. 384; Barnabe Rich, *My Ladies Looking Glass*, 65 ff.; Overbury, *Characters*, ed. Aldington, London, pp. 112 ff.

<sup>17</sup> I, ii, 126.

<sup>18</sup> William Harrison, *Description of England*, London, 1807, II, p. 276.

<sup>19</sup> Sir Thomas Smith in *Life in Shakespeare's England*, ed. J. D. Wilson, p. 5. Cf. J. W. Draper, "Shakespeare's Italianate Courtiers: Osric," *R. L. C.*, 1935, p. 289 ff.; Ward, *C. H. E. L.*, V, p. 391; L. F. Salzman, *England in Tudor Times*, London, 1926, pp. 6-7.

<sup>20</sup> Thomas Lodge, *Wits Miserie*, London, 1590, p. 4.

<sup>21</sup> Draper, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

<sup>22</sup> Lodge, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

familiarly,"<sup>23</sup> but spent his time with the Froths, the Pompeys, and the Kate Keepdowns.

Lucio appears to be utterly without sex morals: he sneers at Angelo's chastity;<sup>24</sup> he considers Claudio's punishment for a "game of tick-tack"<sup>25</sup> "ruthless";<sup>26</sup> he contemptuously deserts the mother of his illegitimate child;<sup>27</sup> his head is bald from the "French Disease";<sup>28</sup> his health is broken from illnesses acquired in Mrs. Overdone's establishment;<sup>29</sup> yet, he seems proud of himself. In spite of all this, Claudio considers him a suitable person to escort the "sainted"<sup>30</sup> Isabella to Angelo's court.<sup>31</sup> To the Sixteenth Century this would have been no inconsistency. Although open brothels were against "the law of God," but little was done to suppress them. The Middle Ages punished "letherwite" by fine and imprisonment; Henry VII reduced the number of bawdy houses in a certain district from eighteen to twelve; Henry VIII issued a proclamation purporting to suppress "all stewes on Bankside," and refused prostitutes Christian burial;<sup>32</sup> but, in the reign of Elizabeth, the *feme puteine* plied her trade hindered by little except occasional ecclesiastical action "but smallie regarded of the offenders."<sup>33</sup> The Elizabethans, although they expected young men to "honor matrimony,"<sup>34</sup> regularly considered a vigorous sex life, especially among soldiers, to be an indication of physical courage and virility.<sup>35</sup> Old Justice Shallow boasts that in his youth he knew "where the bona-robas were," and had "the best of them at commandment";<sup>36</sup> Falstaff would teach his sons "to addict themselves to sack," for so one becomes "very hot and valiant";<sup>37</sup> Brathwait takes "batchler sensualitie" for granted,<sup>38</sup> and courtesy books of the period reflect the same attitude. Even the conservative Elyot does not expect unmarried men "ever to live chaste."<sup>39</sup> Lucio, then, was one of a common type of young men whose moral practices were too usual to excite comment.

Lucio appears in the first two acts as a comic character and also as a serious agent in Claudio's behalf; but, in the last three acts, his humor often seems forced, and his behavior is progressively more mischievous. Jestng, with "tongue far from heart," he tells Isabella, is his "familiar sin," and, although he can speak directly to the point when he wishes,<sup>40</sup> he seldom does so. He jokes with both Claudio and Pompey about their

<sup>23</sup> Overbury, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

<sup>24</sup> III, ii, 87 ff.

<sup>25</sup> I, ii, 183.

<sup>26</sup> III, ii, 106.

<sup>27</sup> IV, iii, 167 ff.

<sup>28</sup> I, ii, 32 ff. See Schmidt, *Lexicon*.

<sup>29</sup> I, ii, 43 ff. Obviously the lines are here wrongly assigned. Lines 51-52 should be spoken by Lucio; lines 50 and 53-55, by a Gentleman.

<sup>30</sup> I, iv, 34.

<sup>31</sup> I, ii, 169 ff.

<sup>32</sup> Coke, *Institutes*, London, 1809, III, p. 204-205.

<sup>33</sup> Harrison, *op. cit.*, p. 311.

<sup>34</sup> Elyot, *The Governor*, Bk. III, Chap. xviii.

<sup>35</sup> For a full treatment of this subject, see John W. Draper, "Captain General Othello," *Anglia*, XLIII, p. 296, *et seq.*

<sup>36</sup> 2 Henry IV, III, ii, 25 ff.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, IV, iii, 92 ff.

<sup>38</sup> R. Brathwait, *Essaies*, London, 1620, "Of Marriage," p. 120.

<sup>39</sup> Elyot, *op. cit.*, Bk. III, Chapter xviii.

<sup>40</sup> I, iv, 24-25.



arrests; he amuses the disguised Duke by ridiculing Angelo, then offends him by ridiculing the Duke.<sup>41</sup> When the outraged sovereign expresses dislike for his company, he persists, nevertheless, in annoying him. "I am a kind of burr," he remarks, "I shall stick."<sup>42</sup> Throughout Act V, he constantly strains to appear witty, and, seeming to assume somewhat the prerogative of a court fool, braves the royal displeasure by talking and jesting repeatedly against the Duke's command of silence. If jesting is his familiar sin, it is not his worst one: throughout the last three acts, he appears constantly as a slanderer and potential mischief-maker. He calls the Duke "a superficial, ignorant, unweighing fellow,"<sup>43</sup> and accuses him of lechery and drunkenness.<sup>44</sup> Without provocation, he is nasty to Mariana; also without provocation he maligns the supposed friar, and charges him with his own crime of *lèse majesté* against the Duke;<sup>45</sup> he even makes nasty insinuations against Isabella,<sup>46</sup> whom he earlier held "ensky'd and sainted";<sup>47</sup> and even the notorious Mrs. Overdone, who knows him well indeed, at once attributes her arrest to his mischievous tale-bearing.<sup>48</sup> When, in the last scene, the Duke, in his true identity, accosts him with

You, sirrah, that knew me for a fool, a coward,  
One all of luxury, an ass, a madman;  
Wherein have I so deserved of you,  
That you extol me thus?

Lucio counters with the line that would seem to be the key to an understanding of his behavior: "'Faith, my lord, I spoke it but according to the trick."<sup>49</sup> This, apparently, was sufficient excuse, for the Duke, a moment later, says, "What you have spoke I pardon," but adds a "trick" of his own by causing Lucio to become, through a forced marriage to his mistress, that object for Elizabethan ridicule, a cuckold. Lucio, described in the *Dramatis Personae* as a "fantastic," behaved according to the "trick," or fashion, of his group. A fantastic is defined variously by Elizabethans as "an improvident young gallant";<sup>50</sup> "an effeminate fool";<sup>51</sup> "an extraordinary man in ordinary things";<sup>52</sup> and "one that is so neere a kin to the foole, that they cannot marry without a license from the Pope." According to Rich, a fantastic "thinks boldnesse to be a principall part of *vertue*, and that makes him to become impudent: his greatest observation is about the *New fashion*: his ambition is, to bee highly commended."<sup>53</sup> Rowlands speaks of "Signieur Fantistike, who scorns so many things";<sup>54</sup> and Marston's *Pygmal* contains the line "Thou art Bedlam mad and glori'st to be counted

<sup>41</sup> III, ii, *passim*.

<sup>42</sup> IV, iv, 171 ff.

<sup>43</sup> III, ii, 130.

<sup>44</sup> III, ii, 168 ff.

<sup>45</sup> V, i, 128 ff; 149; 261 ff; 281; 302; 331 ff.

<sup>46</sup> V, i, 274 ff.

<sup>47</sup> I, iv, 34.

<sup>48</sup> III, ii, 168 ff.

<sup>49</sup> V, i, 498 ff.

<sup>50</sup> N. E. D. quoting Overbury.

<sup>51</sup> N. Breton, *The Good and the Badde*.

<sup>52</sup> Earle, *Microcosmographie*, No. LXXI.

<sup>53</sup> Rich, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

<sup>54</sup> Samuel Rowlands, *Works*, Hunterian Club, 1880, 3 vols., p. 19.

a fantastic."<sup>55</sup> Lucio, then, apparently had a large group of prototypes who annoyed citizens of contemporary London much as he annoyed the other characters in *Measure for Measure*.

From the hurly-burly of Elizabethan street-life, Shakespeare took Lucio, who, a petty gentleman in rank, moved principally in the underworld, considered his depraved morals an indication of virility, and, in his behavior as a "fantastic," followed the fashion of his kind by attempting, through impudence and malicious gossip, to attract attention to his own smartness, boldness, and sophistication. Lucio would be merely comic if the dramatist had not taken pains to develop his character — a character which, although unique in Shakespeare in its entirety, has parallels among others of the poet's numerous realistic figures. Falstaff has much of his morals and his bragadoccio;<sup>56</sup> Roderigo is a gentleman similarly without constructive interests who has lapsed into bad company;<sup>57</sup> Armado, the "fantastical Spaniard," believing that to be a "gentleman and gamester" is to possess the "varnish of a complete man," could be Lucio's intimate;<sup>58</sup> and Iago, the burly soldier,<sup>59</sup> outdoes him in foulness of speech. Like Parolles and Falstaff, he speaks false slander and is apprehended by his intended victim. If, as Albrecht and Draper believe, *Measure for Measure* was intended as a compliment to King James,<sup>60</sup> then Lucio's slanders against the Duke must have been introduced to exemplify the "malicious lying tongues" that James complained had "traduced" him.<sup>61</sup> In the first two Acts, Lucio is essential to the plot as a means of contact between Claudio and Isabella, but in the last three, he has no influence upon the course of action. His vicious attack upon the Duke's character, without antecedent in Whetstone, and meaningless to the plot, is readily understandable as an effort to ridicule, for the King's benefit, the troublesome gossipers who so greatly annoyed him. Professor Wilson rapidly discusses the style of the play, then asks the reader to decide whether or not Shakespeare could have written many of Lucio's lines; and, basing his argument wholly upon this discussion, decides that Lucio was developed by a post-Shakespearean reviser.<sup>62</sup> Professor Quiller-Couch, Professor Wilson's associate, suggests that the play was possibly written while Shakespeare was unbalanced, through being "enamoured of a wanton, who betrayed him."<sup>63</sup> But Lucio, examined in the light of sixteenth century culture-history, needs no more apology than Falstaff, or Iago, or Autolycus,<sup>64</sup> or any other of Shakespeare's

<sup>55</sup> Marston, *Pygmal*, London, 1598, III, p. 148.

<sup>56</sup> See John W. Draper, "Sir John Falstaff," *R. E. S.*, VIII, p. 414 et seq.

<sup>57</sup> See John W. Draper, "This Poor Trash of Venice," *J. E. G. Ph.*, XXX, p. 508 ff.

<sup>58</sup> See D. C. Boughner, "Don Armado as a Gallant," *Rev. Anglo-amér.*, XIII, p. 18 et seq.

<sup>59</sup> See John W. Draper, "'Honest Iago,'" *P. M. L. A.*, XLVI, p. 724 et seq.

<sup>60</sup> See Louis Albrecht, *Neue Untersuchungen zu Shakespeares Mass für Mass*, Berlin, 1914, *passim*; and J. W. Draper, "Political Themes," *vid. sup.*, p. 82 et seq.

<sup>61</sup> James I, *Political Works*, ed. McIlwain, Cambridge, Mass., 1918, *Basilikon Doron*, p. 13.

<sup>62</sup> Wilson and Quiller-Couch, *op. cit.*, pp. 97-113.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, p. xxiv.

<sup>64</sup> See Christine White, "The Biography of Autolycus," *Bulletin of the Amer. Shak. Assoc.*, about to appear.

realistic Renaissance figures. Drawn in detail from contemporary life, he takes, in the earlier acts, a natural and necessary part in the plot, and, in the latter acts, gives, through his asininites, a farcical strain to an otherwise sombre comedy; and provides also, perhaps, a piquant, timely reference to King James' fear and hatred of detractors.

West Virginia University.

REGINALD LAWSON.

### Some Widsith Notes

The review of my edition of *Widsith* by Professor W. Fischer in E.S. XIX 211-214 includes a few slips of the pen which I should like to set right. (1) The three *fits* into which I divide the body of *Widsith*'s speech are not "made up of name lists," but include name lists or *thulas*. If the *fits* were actually made up of word lists, then *fit* and *thula* would simply be two names for the same thing (so far as *Widsith* was concerned, at least). And F. in fact seems to treat the two terms as interchangeable when he says, "The second *thula* contains, in addition, 'five sections, more or less lyrical in character,' which the editor styles 'yeds' ...." Here F. means the second *fit*, but calls it the second *thula*. (2) In spite of F.'s quotation marks, the reader of my edition will seek in vain for the form *yeds*. I speak of one *yed*, and one only. It falls into five sections, indeed, but these are all parts of one and the same *yed*, not separate *yeds*. (3) F. says of my three *fits* that they "roughly coincide with the 'natural' divisions, or 'lays,' distinguished by previous scholars." But my predecessors, though they distinguished two or three natural divisions (to which answer my three *fits*), usually spoke of only one *lay* (to which answers, roughly, my *yed*). One cannot understand my exposition of the poem without making a rigorous distinction between the terms *fit*, *thula* and *yed* as I use them. (4) The *Wrosnan* were hardly a Danish tribe, though they may plausibly be localized on what is now Danish territory. (5) F. is right in thinking that I regard lines 14-17 as interpolated, but wrong in supposing that I do so "on the strength of a very bold hypothesis ...." Whether the hypothesis stands or falls, the lines remain (in my view) an interpolation; here, of course, I simply follow my predecessors, who differ from me in explaining otherwise (or not at all) how the lines came to be interpolated. (6) In my text I left the reading *Persum* unchanged, because my principles of textual criticism did not permit me to emend a reading (however unsatisfactory it might be) if that reading made sense of any kind. In my footnote, however, and again in the glossary of proper names, I made it clear that emendation to *Wersum* would greatly improve the text. It was only my systematic extreme conservatism which kept me from making this emendation. (7) By misprint, line 24b appears as line 246. (8) My translation of line 9a is not 'hostile to treaties' but 'hostile to treaty-breakers' — a very different thing. (9) A reference to Klaeber's comments on *mid Ealhilde* in the E. A. Kock *Festschrift* would have been in place. (10) It is hardly right to speak of a "splitting of the *Eadwine* of our poem." Two persons of the name are



mentioned in the poem, and if I treat them accordingly I do not see that I have done any splitting, though if I identified them I might be said to have done some joining. Had the poet himself identified them the case would of course be different. Then their separation would be a splitting indeed.

Baltimore, U.S.A.

KEMP MALONE.

### In Memoriam

W. van der Gaaf, L. P. H. Eijkman, Jos. Mansion, Emile Legouis

The study of English language and literature has recently suffered heavy losses. The Swedish toponymist, R. E. Zachrisson, was commemorated in our last issue. W. van der Gaaf, emeritus professor of English in the University of Amsterdam, died on October 9, aged seventy. He was one of the most valuable supporters of *English Studies*; apart from his Heidelberg thesis, *The Transition from the Impersonal to the Personal Construction in Middle English* (1904), his contributions to our journal far outnumber those published elsewhere. His knowledge of the history of the English language, combined with his command of modern English, were unrivalled in his own country, and as an academic teacher he had few equals. His death, only six months after Poutsma's, leaves the study of English in Holland seriously impoverished.

L. P. H. Eijkman, who died at The Hague on November 28, aged eighty-three, contributed a number of articles on Dutch and English phonetics to vols. X, XI and XII of *E.S.* His merits as a phonetician, and as editor of *De Drie Talen*, were set forth in vol. XVI of *E.S.*, on the occasion of the semi-centenary of that journal, and of its editor's eightieth birthday. His last publication in book form was a concise manual of Dutch phonetics, *Phonetiek van het Nederlands*, an abridgement of the *Leerboek der Phonetiek* published by Eijkman in 1928 jointly with Professor Zwaardemaker.

Joseph Mansion, professor of comparative philology in the University of Liège, Belgium, died on November 8, aged sixty. To readers of *English Studies* he was best known as an authority on place-name research, through his reviews of the successive volumes of the English Place-Name Society, and of other publications in the same field. His principal work, *Oud-Gentsche Naamkunde* (1924), is an important contribution to the study of Old Dutch; his other publications range from Old High German to Greek and Sanskrit. He will be remembered for his courtesy no less than for his impressive learning.

Though he never contributed to our journal, we will not omit mentioning the death of the *doyen* of English scholarship in France, Professor Emile Legouis. His studies of Chaucer, Spenser and Wordsworth, his *History*

of *English Literature* written in collaboration with Louis Cazamian, not to mention his other publications, are well known to students of English literature all over the world. He was one of the founders of the *Revue Anglo-Américaine*, recently transformed into *Etudes Anglaises*, to the November number of which Professor Cazamian contributes an obituary notice. "Après Auguste Angellier, Emile Legouis est le maître qui a formé en France, directement ou indirectement, deux générations de spécialistes des sujets anglais." Our French colleagues may take comfort in the thought that they have no lack of capable scholars to carry on his work.

---

## Reviews

### Sidneiana

*Sir Philip Sidney and the Arcadia.* By M. S. GOLDMAN. (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. XVII, Nos. 1-2.) 236 pp. The University of Illinois. 1934. \$ 2.25.

*Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman.* By K. O. MYRICK. (Harvard Studies in English, XIV.) ix + 322 pp. Harvard University Press. 1935. \$ 3.50.

*The English Epic Tradition.* By E. M. W. TILLYARD. War-ton Lecture on English Poetry, British Academy, 1936. 23 pp. London: Milford. 1936. 1s. 6d.

*Philip Sidney.* By E. M. DENKINGER. x + 317 pp. New York: Brentano. London: Allen & Unwin. 1932. 16s.

*Sir Philip Sidney. A Study in Conflict.* By C. H. WARREN. ix + 240 pp. London: Nelson & Sons. 1936. 7s. 6d.

*Sir Philip Sidney en France.* Par A. W. OSBORN. (Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature Comparée, 84.) 171 + xlvii pp. Paris: Champion. 1932. 30 fr.

Goldman's study contains a survey of the principal biographies of Sidney, and of Arcadian criticism down to the end of the nineteenth century; an account of Sidney's life in relation to his writings; chapters on the *Arcadia* as heroic romance, on the contemporary scene in the *Arcadia*, and on Malory's *Morte d'Arthur* as a probable source; an Appendix, a Bibliography, and numerous footnotes. The author is at pains to show that in the *Arcadia* as well as in the *Defence of Poesie* Sidney drew upon real experience, and that he wrote and revised the *Arcadia* not merely to amuse his sister, but to present a guide to noble and heroic conduct.

The book gives evidence of a considerable amount of research and presents a view of the man and his work which, though based on a number

of not wholly irrefutable assumptions, has much to commend it. It suffers from a somewhat tiresome effusiveness and from a tendency to expatiate and digress. In his treatment of the *Arcadia* the author confines his attention to the serious aspects of the romance, with an almost complete disregard of its irrational elements — a procedure which vitiates a good deal of recent Arcadian criticism.

K. O. Myrick is another exponent of the 'serious' conception of the *Arcadia*. According to him the romance, or at least its revised version, was written in complete harmony with Sidney's views of the function of poetry as expressed in the *Defence*, and under the direct influence of Minturno's theory of the epic. So far from being a 'trifle', as Sidney himself modestly called it, the *Arcadia* is to be regarded as a deliberate literary experiment, intended to delight as well as to teach, by presenting idealized characters exemplifying virtues and vices and moving in a world governed by poetic justice.

The argument, though ably stated, has its weak spots. The author dismisses rather too easily the prevalent opinion that Sidney recast his romance in imitation of Heliodorus and Montemayor. Like Goldman, he over-rationalizes the *Arcadia*, and if he does not entirely ignore its less serious aspects, he does his best to minimize their significance.

Nevertheless the two books mark a wholesome reaction from the allegorical interpretation of the *Arcadia* propagated by Greenlaw and Brie. In England the latter has never taken root; but the 'serious' view, which has the sanction of Sidney's modern editor, Prof. Feuillerat, has at least obtained a foothold there in Mr. Tillyard's Warton Lecture (1936), in which it is affirmed on circumstantial evidence that 'Sidney considered *Arcadia* an epic.'

The story of Sidney's life has been re-told, exuberantly by Miss Denkinger (*Immortal Sidney*; English title toned down to *Philip Sidney*), unpretentiously, if unimpressively, by Mr. Warren. Both deserve credit for refusing to repeat the nineteenth-century legends concerning Sidney's relations with Spenser, and for not even mentioning that blessed word 'Areopagus', or the story of Spenser's supposed visit to Penshurst. What they have to say on Sidney's writings is not particularly illuminating, while their account of the *Arcadia* leaves one wondering whether, like Virginia Woolf<sup>1</sup>, they have never heard of the existence of two different versions.

Mr. Warren's book contains a rather large number of misprints; thus Warnfeld, the scene of Sidney's last fight, should be Warnsfeld, or rather Warnsveld. Miss Denkinger's Index is commendably full; but, out of eight references to Penshurst Place (which Mr. Warren incorrectly calls Penshurst Castle), four are wrong. Both volumes contain a few good illustrations.

Osborn's *Sir Philip Sidney en France* deals chiefly with Sidney's friendship with prominent Frenchmen of his time, with French influence on his writings, and with French translations of the *Arcadia*. There are also a biographical sketch and an account of Sidney's 'fortune littéraire' in

1 *The Common Reader: Second Series*, p. 49.



France from the beginning of the seventeenth century down to the present day.

Though containing a good deal of useful information this book has the appearance rather than the true character of a work of scholarship. The author does not always make it clear how much he owes to his predecessors and what is the result of his own investigations, and thus, by implication, sometimes assumes credit for discoveries and conclusions that is really due to others. His information is frequently at fault, as when he states that Thomas More did not write in English, or when he censures French translators for correctly rendering words used by Sidney in a sense no longer current. Worst of all, in his biographical chapters he has appropriated numerous passages from Wallace's *Life of Sir Philip Sidney* in almost literal translation, presenting them as his own, without the slightest acknowledgement. Further comment is surely superfluous.

The Hague.

R. W. ZANDVOORT.

*Untersuchungen über die Romankunst von Wilkie Collins.* Von HANS SEHLBACH. 184 pp. Jena: Frommannsche Buchhandlung. 1931. 8,50 RM.

The greater part of the book is taken up by an analysis of Collins' novels by means of a "cataloguing method" similar to, but not identical with, that of Dibelius. Collins' technique is examined and the various devices by which he obtains his effects enumerated in great detail. The method is so mechanical that, given sufficient time and patience, almost anybody can turn out a book about any author by its aid. True, the book may be only a "collection of raw materials", as Dr. Sehlbach says too modestly of his own. The method may, however, be applied with more or less skill. Dr. Sehlbach does it very well indeed. He is clearly a competent critic with a wide knowledge of English literature, an acute literary sense, and a style which is to the point and, when his method allows it, agreeable. Moreover, Collins is a writer who lends himself exceptionally well to such treatment, for all his effects depend on deliberate tricks of style and construction.

Dr. Sehlbach calls Collins' novels "sensational stories", and not detective stories and in this he is right, *pace* Mr. T. S. Eliot, whom he quotes as calling *The Moonstone* the first, the longest, and the best of modern detective stories. For even *The Moonstone* is not a detective story in the modern sense of the word. The description of the detective at work is entirely subordinate and takes up little space, and the solution of the mystery is not brought about by the deductions of the detective or any other character in the story.

There are some interesting initial chapters on Collins' little known life, on the influence of such extraneous factors as serial publication and the Victorian demand for three-volume novels, and of Collins' relations with Dickens. Of the latter, Dr. Sehlbach remarks that the subject calls for closer study than he has been able to give it here. It is to be wished that Dr. Sehlbach will follow up this subject, with which he is so well qualified to deal. Apart from his place in the development of the detective story, Collins is likely to be chiefly remembered for his influence on Dickens.

A study of this influence might even solve the mystery of *Edwin Drood*: seeing that in that book Dickens was obviously trying to model himself on Collins, a knowledge of the latter's technique, such as Dr. Sehlbach possesses, might perhaps make it possible to trace the continuation of those lines in the plot which were broken off by Dickens' death.

Copenhagen.

C. A. BODELSEN.

Jerome K. Jerome. *Seine Persönlichkeit und literarische Bedeutung*. Von WALTER GUTKESS. 116 pp. Jena: Frommannsche Buchhandlung. 1930. 5.40 RM.

The book is divided into three parts. The first consists of a detailed account of Jerome's plays, essays, travel books, novels, and short stories. Part 2 is biographical, and part 3 deals with Jerome's place in English literature.

The author's estimate of Jerome is so high that probably few readers will be found to agree with it. The amiable, but not very important author of *Three Men in a Boat* and *Idle Thoughts of an Idle Fellow* is treated with a gravity as if he were Swift or Fielding:

Jeromes Seelenverfassung ist durch einen Antagonismus von Meditation und Aktivität als strukturellen Dispositionen gekennzeichnet.

... einige wahre Kleinode fein pointierter humoristischer Kabinettkunst ...

Die Charakterisierungskunst (in *Three Men in a Boat*) ist meisterhaft.

Diese an Swift erinnernden Seiten ...

Über die Landschaft urteilt Jerome: "Niagara disappointed me" (S. 237). "The Rockies are imposing, but lack human interest" (S. 239). "The Prairies are depressing" (S. 237). "California is beautiful" (S. 238).

Er hat feines kunsthistorisches Verständniss für Kingstons alte Häuser, die aus der Zeit stammen, "when men knew how to build".

A good many of the author's quotations from Jerome read dangerously like parody:

Motherhood is the law of the Universe. The whole duty of man is to be a mother ... Is the eternal Universe one dim figure, Motherhood filling all space?

... the Lady of the Love-lit Eyes ...

Make a home, lad, for the woman who loves you; gather one or two friends about you; work, think, and play, that will bring you happiness.

They (the Germans) are a simple, earnest, homely, genuine people. They do not laugh much; but when they do, they laugh deep down. They are slow, but so is a deep river. A placid look generally rests upon their heavy features, but sometimes they frown, and then they look somewhat grim ...

In the course of the discussion of Jerome's place in English literature contained in part 3, the author mentions Addison, Steele, Dr. Johnson (between whom and Jerome he finds "some interesting parallels"), Sterne, and, less surprisingly, Dickens, Barry Pain, Pett Ridge, Anstey, W. W. Jacobs, Mark Twain, and some others.

With his judgement that "R. L. Stevenson und Jerome verbindet in vielen Punkten eine geistige Verwandtschaft" few students of Stevenson will probably agree, and Stevenson would certainly have resented it.

Copenhagen.

C. A. BODELSEN.

*Henry Adams.* By JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS. 246 pp. 8°. London: George Routledge & Sons, Ltd. 1933. 10s.

*The Education of Henry Adams* has grown on us as one of the classics of autobiographical writing. It never arrived; its appearance in public in 1913 was almost immediately eclipsed by the War. But when the War was over, *The Education* was there and today it is taken almost as a matter of course. Adams's other writings, notably his long history of a short period in the political development of America, have their place in the specialist's library, but *The Education* and *Mont St. Michel and Chartres* belong even more than the novel *Democracy* to literature in the narrower sense of the word. But they are not easy reading; especially *The Education* taxes one's power of concentration and one's memory of political and scientific history. And since it is essentially introspective and designed to trace the reaction of a man's soul to the influences of the outer world, it lacks surface, a tangible exterior, perspective. One sees the world as Adams saw it, but one gets only a very hazy glimpse of Adams himself.

Adams's namesake — but no relation of his — the well-known historian of American cultural development, now supplies the omission. He had originally undertaken a biographical introduction to Adams's collected works in many volumes, but the collection could not be published because of financial difficulties and so the introduction has been issued in a spacious volume by itself. It is not a complete biography, that has absorbed *The Education* and its subject's other works, it is merely a supplement to what *The Education* offers, supplying data the older Adams left out, omitting portions, however, that Henry Adams had seen fit not to mention — e.g. the period of his marriage — and occasionally correcting or bringing into the right perspective statements made in *The Education* many years after the event. Balance, consequently, is of minor consideration; otherwise one might complain that the later parts are too scanty and hurried as compared to the earlier ones, especially the introductory chapter on 'The Heritage' in its Henry Adamsian leisureliness. But as a sketch of the main phases of Adams's life the book is exceedingly welcome and for the first time places Henry Adams in sharp outline before his readers.

We get a succinct account of Adams's two years in Germany and Switzerland — Berlin, Dresden, Thun, the Rhine, Dresden again, etc. — before, in 1861, he again left America to act as private secretary to his father, now Lincoln's ambassador to the Court of St. James's. Adams's extra-official activities as British correspondent for American papers and his very undiplomatic attitude on the question of British intervention in the American Civil War is unearthed from his long-forgotten printed letters to the New York press, and the lure of Europe and especially of England, which so much impeded the young man's further steps in search of a career after the war was over, is convincingly brought out. Journalism, as a source of power, became Adams's choice, but Harvard and Charles Eliot's academic reforms became his fate. As a professor of history Adams was a decided success, being the first to introduce a real seminar and research methods into American universities. "Socially", however, "he preferred even Congressmen to professors" — in spite of the presence at Harvard of men like James Russell Lowell and William James — and after seven years he married a lady of means and settled in Washington for private study and writing.



There were no children, but there was "the most distinguished salon ever held" in the American capital. It was during these years that *Democracy, An American Novel*, was written and anonymously published (1880). But in 1885 Mrs. Adams suddenly died and twilight settled on Adams's life. Though his friendship with Saint Gaudens produced, as a monument on the grave in Rock Creek Cemetery, one of the finest of the sculptor's works, Adams's mind was not essentially artistic but rather analytically intellectual, and the pursuit of the last decades of his life was the attempt to place history on the basis of an exact science. Hence his two most lasting books: *Mont St. Michel and Chartres* as an interpretation of the medieval mind and *The Education* of himself as the analysis of a modern man. Both were privately printed — in 1904 and 1907 respectively — and did not reach the general public till years later. Henry Adams died on the night of March 27th, 1918.

There are several slips. When Adams went to Berlin in the fall of 1858 the Prussian government was not "under Bismarck", who did not become Prime Minister till four years later. And it is difficult to see how Adams and his sister, travelling from Thun to the Rhine in 1859, "crossed the frontier between the opposing lines", since the Sardinian War was localized in the Po valley. The illustrations are mostly poor reproductions of good pictures. The bibliography at the end is valuable.

Basel.

H. LÜDEKE.

*The Collected Poems of Stephen Crane.* Edited by WILSON FOLLETT. [vi] and 132 pp. 8°. New York and London: Alfred A. Knopf. 1930. \$2.50.

Although Crane's position in American literature rests almost entirely on his prose tales his first acknowledged publication in book form was his poetry. *The Black Riders* appeared at Boston in 1895 and preceded *The Red Badge of Courage* by several months. But while *The Red Badge* was a great success, the reception accorded *The Black Riders* was such that Crane did not publish a second book of poems till four years later when *War is Kind and Other Lines* appeared at New York in 1899, Crane at that time being in England and dying of tuberculosis. After his death some of his papers passed into the hands of a friend in Florida; among them three hitherto unknown poems were discovered and published in the *American Bookman* of April 1929 by Carl Bohnenberger, Assistant Librarian of the Jacksonville Library. Both published collections and the three posthumous poems have now been re-collected in a finely printed but comparatively inexpensive edition by one of the best authorities on Crane in America.

The indebtedness of Crane to Emily Dickinson as regards his poetry is accepted as such an incontrovertible fact by Thomas Beer, his biographer, that he refuses to date the writing of *The Black Riders* earlier than April 1, 1893, since it was on that date that Howells read Emily's poems to him. A close comparison of these poems as then published with those of

Crane, however, does not lend much support to this view, however strong the evidence may be that tradition and the reminiscences of Garland and Howells offer. Crane heard the first two collections, published in 1890 and 1891, but among these poems only one (No. lii in the first part of the *Collected Poems*, London 1933) is in unrimed and unrhythmical "free verse" of the kind developed by Crane. The great body of Emily's work is rimed, more or less, and very conventionally rhythmical; from her, Crane could hardly have received much suggestion for what he was to do later. Her terseness of diction, of course, and the freshness and vigor of her imagery would make a deep impression on him. But his own poetry is terse in a different sense, and imagery, so strong an element in his prose, is conspicuously weak in *The Black Riders*. Any impetus he may have got from Emily must have blended with a stronger impulse from another source, and that source undoubtedly was Whitman, whose treatment of rime and rhythm stands much closer to Crane's practice than Emily's does.

Crane was a lone wolf in the desert of American poetry in his day. Not that his generation was to blame. Poetically he had not much to say and his second collection shows that he was only developing his expression when he died. But a dozen years after his death American poetry entered upon a new life along lines marked out by Whitman and certain tendencies in European literature, and Emily, and with her, Crane, were now reclaimed as pioneers. The historical roots of the new movement have not yet been unearthed, but in any case Crane's formal proximity to such work as the *Spoon River Anthology* and Ezra Pound's early poems will hardly have been accidental. Crane enriched modern English prose in many subtle ways; his poetry, with all its experimental slightness, will surely gain in historical importance as the years pass.

Basel.

H. LÜDEKE.

## Current Literature: 1936

### II. Criticism and Biography

The first book to which attention should be drawn in a survey of this nature, strictly speaking falls within the category of history rather than literature, but I mention it here since it is one of the most important studies of English thought and institutions in the nineteenth century that has appeared for some years. I refer to G. M. Young's *Victorian England, The Portrait of an Age* (Oxford University Press, 7/6). In a most thoughtful and scholarly treatise, founded on wide reading and research, and displaying a remarkable ability to grasp the essential spirit of the age with which he is concerned, Mr. Young paints a vivid picture of the Victorian period in all its chief aspects — political, sociological, religious, philanthropic, industrial and scientific. His book is not merely a record of facts or a compilation of statistics; he seeks always to get to the significance of the facts and their relevance to the contemporary view of human nature. It might well be called a study in the psychological development of English society over three quarters of a century, for the keynote is

one of continuity in evolution. Few people now, probably, talk of the "Victorian age" as though it was static and homogeneous throughout; certainly after reading Mr. Young's book one cannot do so, for if there is one fact that emerges from it more clearly than any other it is that the men of the nineteenth century were constantly shifting their ground, and that the faith of 1837 was by no means the faith of 1887. In two of their assumptions only did the Victorians refuse to budge: their belief in representative institutions as the foundation of all stable government, and their belief in the sanctity of the family. Any student of the nineteenth century should find this book both interesting and illuminating. The writers of the day are frequently drawn upon for evidence and illustration, for the England that Mr. Young depicts is the England that produced the works of Dickens and Thackeray, of George Eliot, Carlyle, Ruskin and Kingsley.

General studies of the apparatus and principles of criticism have been numerous. An excursion into literary theory has been made by H. Norman Hurst in a doctoral dissertation entitled *Four Elements in Literature* (Longmans, 6/—). The four elements which the author distinguishes are what he calls the Outer, the Inner, Energy and Balance. The Outer corresponds, in the main, to the objective side of the writer's art. It is the instrument of the realist, and in poetry found its fullest manifestation in the eighteenth century, though its most natural medium is prose. The Inner, on the other hand, corresponds to the subjective and is characteristic of the romantic, as distinct from the classic. Under the heading of Energy Mr. Hurst includes the powers of expression and creation — the ability of a writer, whether he be concerned with the outer or the inner, to convey convincingly to his reader the significance which they have for him — while Balance he considers the most important element of all four. He makes the term cover a wide field: the balance between style and subject, word and idea, the outer and the inner, the material and the spiritual, man and nature. There is very little that one can dispute in Mr. Hurst's contentions. The main faults are, on the one hand, that his classification is altogether too general and superficial, and on the other that much that he says with almost pontifical gravity is so obvious that it is scarcely worth the emphasis and the lengthy discussion that he gives it.

A better book (this time a study of the moderns) is to be found in *New Literary Values*, by David Daiches (Edinburgh. Oliver & Boyd, 5/—). Mr. Daiches crosses swords dexterously with those who still preach the doctrine of Art for Art's Sake or would have us believe that any kind of inquiry into the faith of an author or his age is quite irrelevant in making a judgement of his works. On the contrary, he declares, literature itself is irrelevant apart from the beliefs which an author shares with his public. The individual writers with whom Mr. Daiches deals are Gerard Manley Hopkins, Wilfred Owen and Katherine Mansfield. Hopkins is treated less for his own merits than for his influence upon poets of the present day; Wilfred Owen is revealed as one of the most trustworthy of war-poets and in his absence of sentimentality is contrasted with Siegfried Sassoon, while Katherine Mansfield appears as a short-story writer with a technique all her own. All these essays deserve a careful perusal.

Attention should also be directed to Professor Lane Cooper's little volume



*Evolution and Repentance* (Cornell University Press and Oxford University Press, 10/6). It consists mainly of essays upon Aristotle, Plato and Dante, all of which fall outside the scope of the present survey; but there is a thoughtful paper dealing with Matthew Arnold's Essay on Wordsworth, in which the author contests Arnold's assertion that Wordsworth was unconcerned with glory or the possibility of personal reputation, while in one or two of the other essays — particularly the final one on "Loss and Gain" — there are some shrewd observations upon the general principles of literary criticism and the formation of taste. But more relevant to our present purpose is a volume by Dr. F. S. Boas, entitled *From Richardson to Pinero* (Murray, 8/6), in which the author has collected a number of his writings (all previously published but two) on the literature of the nineteenth century. He examines Thackeray's conception of the hero as evidenced in his lectures on the Eighteenth Century Humourists and he discusses Wordsworth's patriotic poems in relation to his changing attitude towards France, at the same time drawing a comparison with the attitude of the average thinking Englishman towards Germany (or of the German towards England) in the years 1914—1918. There is an illuminating study of Tennyson's symbolism in the *Idylls of the King* and its relation to "Victorianism"; the lyric verse of Matthew Arnold is subjected to a re-examination and a re-assessment, while the book closes with a review of Sir Arthur Pinero's contribution to English drama and his achievement as a stage chronicler. Many of these essays will already be familiar to students of English literature, but it is well worth making their acquaintance anew.

One can always look to the Royal Society of Literature for scholarship and critical acumen, and the fourteenth volume of its Transactions, edited by the Earl of Lytton and published under the title *Essays by Divers Hands* (Oxford University Press, 7/—) fully maintains the standard set by its predecessors. There are several excellent papers which cannot be noticed here, since they fall outside our immediate scope, but to three at least<sup>1</sup> the student of nineteenth and twentieth century letters will find it worth while to give attention. Dean Inge writes upon "Plato and Ruskin", distinguishing carefully the Platonic and non-Platonic elements in Ruskin's teaching, and incidentally digressing into a discussion of Platonism in relation to nineteenth century thought and culture as a whole. Mr. N. Hardy Wallis has an illuminating paper upon "James Thomson and the City of Dreadful Night" in which he seeks to account for Thomson's pessimism and to give an appreciative estimate of the poem, while Mr. St. John Ervine, coming to more recent times, examines the plays of Noel Coward in relation to the spirit of the post-war years. Mr. Coward, he insists, far from being the light-hearted *farceur* that some people suppose him, is in reality a very serious dramatist, puritanical in outlook, indicting the aimlessness and folly of modern life. Frequently he compares him to Shakespeare, though he admits that Mr. Coward's plays are called forth by his age in a sense that Shakespeare's never were. This volume of essays is full of good reading.

---

<sup>1</sup> Excluding one on Mark Twain and another on Guillaume Thomas Raynol, who, of course, not being English, do not call for consideration here.

No new work on the general literary history of the period has appeared, though *Modern English Literature, 1798-1935*, by A. J. Wyatt and Henry Clay (University Tutorial Press, 5/—) has been published in a second edition, with a completely new section on the twentieth century. But there is unfortunately no list of reference books, and the section on the drama is lacking in definiteness both on tendencies and individuals. Still, for all that, it is a useful handbook, giving a great many facts within a small compass.

Though Stephen Gwynn's *Irish Literature and Drama* (Nelson, 6/—) starts at a point contemporary with the Johnsonian age in England, by far the greater part of it deals with the last hundred odd years, bringing the survey practically up to the present day. The aim is to trace out the growth of a characteristically Irish, as distinct from Gaelic, literature during that period (i.e. literature written in the English language, but reflecting Irish life, character and national consciousness), and consequently many of the writers mentioned by Mr. Gwynn, in the earlier section especially, are not those most familiar to the student of English. Conversely, too, authors who are Irish only by virtue of their parentage and have given little to national literature (e.g. Bernard Shaw) are either omitted altogether or given only cursory treatment. Mr. Gwynn finds the beginnings of the Irish Literary Renaissance as far back as the early years of the nineteenth century, when William Carleton won fame by his realistic tales of peasant life and the two Banim brothers were publishing *Tales of the O'Hara Family*. These writers were the lineal predecessors of Synge, Colum and Sean O'Casey, and Mr. Gwynn follows out through several chapters the development of Irish literature during the hundred years that separated them. There are brief but pointed revaluations of the well known figures of the last three decades, and in the chapter on the prose fiction of modern Ireland we are introduced to a number of writers less well known than their contemporaries in the fields of poetry and drama, but no less important. This is a most informative book on a phase of modern literature which is known only partially to the average student of English letters. Mr. Gwynn's great achievement is that he has revealed its real significance and shewn it in its proper proportions by putting it into its historical setting.

As compared with the prose of the nineteenth century, the poetry of the period has received little attention from critics. Still another study of romanticism (there already exist 11,396, so our author assures us) appears in F. L. Lucas' *The Decline and Fall of the Romantic Ideal* (Cambridge University Press, 8/6). On such a contentious subject many, no doubt, will dissent from the views here advanced, but this at least is to be said for the work: it is scholarly, level-headed and full of discerning criticism. In the true modern spirit Mr. Lucas approaches his subject with Freud fresh in his mind, for, he declares, "the advantage of the Freudian view-point is that it links together various characteristics of romanticism, some healthy and some morbid, that hitherto seemed arbitrary and disconnected." The final conclusion of his examination is that "the fundamental quality of romanticism is not mere anti-classicism, nor mediaevalism, nor aspiration, nor wonder, nor any of the other things its various formulas suggest; but rather a liberation of the less conscious levels of the mind. ... The romantic intoxication of the imagination suspends the over-rigid censorship exerted by our sense of what is fact and our sense of what is

fitting. The first of these dominates the extreme realist; both inhibit the extreme classicist; the romantic escapes." This, of course, puts the position in terms of modern psychology; but one wonders whether, after all, it does not amount practically to the same as the earlier conclusions which Mr. Lucas regards as inadequate. As for our author himself, his sympathies are all with the romantics. "The Romantic Revival may look pallid now", he writes. "The Sleeping Beauty sleeps again, but she is not dead."

After the one or two really excellent books of the past few years there has been a lull in Wordsworth studies. *The Religion of Wordsworth* by A. D. Martin (Allen & Unwin, 3/6) is in the main superficial, and reads too much like an attempt to bring Wordsworth's authority to justify the author's own religious position rather than a critical and constructive examination of Wordsworth's faith. Mr. Martin speaks somewhat disparagingly of certain critics and biographers of Wordsworth, and in his preface lays claim to a good deal of originality, apparently quite unaware of the fact that in many of his conclusions he had been anticipated by Miss Batho, whose recent book *The Later Wordsworth* he seems never to have read.

In a volume which he entitles *In Defence of Shelley and Other Essays* (Heinemann, 10/6) Herbert Read, one of the best known of modern critics on the romantic period, attempts a vindication of Shelley against the depreciation of him by T. S. Eliot in *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism*: and it is a vindication which is at least interesting if it is not totally convincing. Mr. Read, very much impressed by the discoveries and theories of modern psycho-analysis, sets out to examine the mental state of Shelley as it is revealed in his poetry and his correspondence, as well as in what his friends had to say of him, and the result is that he finds in him all the signs of homosexuality. He was, he declares, an introvert by nature, and this fact alone explains the subjective strain in his poetry. Once realise this, and for Mr. Read all the "shortcomings" and "obscurities" of Shelley's work become explicable and even comprehensible. He was a poet whose prevailing characteristic was sympathy and whose chief poetic excellencies are sublimity and infinitude. Whether or not we can go all the way with Mr. Read, we shall probably feel that he is a little prolix in his arguments. Nor am I at all certain that this essay, which gives the title to the volume, albeit the longest, is really the best or the most discerning. There are studies of Gerard Manley Hopkins and Coventry Patmore which might well rival it for pride of place, and a short paper on "Parallels in English Painting and Poetry" shows the author in the dual rôle of literary and art critic.

Other important contributions to Shelley literature are to be found in the volume *Studies in Shelley*, by Amiyakumar Sen (Calcutta University Press). The five essays which compose this volume were originally published in the journal of the Department of Letters of the University of Calcutta, where Mr. Sen is a lecturer in English literature, and they are now collected for the first time. The author is concerned not so much with Shelley's style and technique but, as he declares in his preface, with "the influence of contemporary movements, both of thought and action, on the poet's mind." Perhaps the most interesting section is that on "Shelley and Indian Thought", a subject which Mr. Sen is able to approach with a knowledge and outlook impossible to critics of the west; but there are also



thoughtful studies of the attitude of the poet to Locke, Hume, Godwin, the Baron d'Holbach and the French Revolution. On these much debated subjects Mr. Sen's views are not always orthodox. He refuses to accept the opinion so often advanced that Shelley's mind was out of touch with reality; on the contrary he finds in his works a continual advance towards the real, which reached its goal and culmination in the treatise *A Philosophical View of Reform*. He is equally convinced that his ready acceptance of the creeds of the different mentors under whose influence he fell during the successive periods of his life has been vastly over-rated. "He was", remarks Mr. Sen, "too independent a thinker to be a mere exponent of other people's ideas." This is a book written with great care and thought, and deserves the attention of all students of Shelley.

Another work that should be of inestimable value (especially to the research worker) is a 362 page volume, *Bibliographies of Twelve Victorian Authors*, compiled by T. C. Ehrsam, R. H. Deily and R. M. Smith (New York, The H. W. Wilson Company \$4.00). The authors represented are Matthew Arnold, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Arthur Hugh Clough, Edward Fitzgerald, Thomas Hardy, Rudyard Kipling, William Morris, Christina Rossetti, D. G. Rossetti, R. L. Stevenson, A. C. Swinburne and Alfred Lord Tennyson. There are about 13,000 entries from over 200 sources (mainly English and American, though French, German and Italian items are also included), and the bibliography has not been confined to published work; unpublished theses etc. have also been listed and full details as to their location added, while in the case of the more important books outstanding reviews have been noticed. The whole volume is a most painstaking piece of work for which may students will be grateful. The lists are complete, the editors inform us, up to July 1934, though items of later date have been added wherever possible while the sheets were going through the press.

From the late nineteenth century we move on to the threshold of the modern period. W. B. Yeats' *Dramatis Personae* (Macmillan, 8/6) is not quite so full of information nor yet so illuminating as one would be led by its title to expect. It is rather in the nature of a miscellany than a methodically compiled record, and a rather haphazard, disconnected kind of miscellany at that. The "Dramatis Personae" actually occupies little more than a third of the book. It throws interesting sidelights upon many of the prominent figures in the Irish Literary Movement — George Moore, Lady Gregory, Edward Martyn and J. M. Synge — while it is most frank in its criticism of their characters as well as their works.

Mr. Yeats has very decided opinions upon these colleagues of his early days, and one sometimes wonders whether they do not proceed, in some part at least, from prejudice. In the case of Synge and Lady Gregory his observations are mainly laudatory; he sees them as idealists with their hearts set upon the creation of a new literature in Ireland and with enough discernment and clarity of intellect to keep the literary question free from the political and religious issues. But in his treatment of George Moore and Edward Martyn he is less complimentary.<sup>2</sup> Of Martyn he writes, "His mind was a fleshless skeleton. He would never learn to write. I used to think that two traditions met and destroyed each other in his blood,

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Dr. Gilomen's article in the June number of this journal.

creating the sterility of a mule." Moore, too, is shewn as egotistical, a little vain, headstrong and not over-considerate of others. There was nothing of delicacy about him, and he would speak his mind irrespective of other people's feelings. Nor was he free from jealousy. On one occasion, Mr. Yeats tells us, he ventured to suggest to Martyn that Moore might have his good points, and the reply was, "I know Moore a great deal better than you do, and he has no good points." A week or two later it was Moore's turn to speak. "That man Martyn", he said, "is the most selfish man alive. He thinks that I am damned, and he doesn't care". Thus one cousin of another.

Mr. Yeats' book is in no sense a work of scholarship, but it is pleasantly written. If it is discursive it is also full of anecdote. Some extracts from his Diary, published under the title "Estrangements", throw, rather fitfully, interesting sidelights upon his own mind and poetic creed, while similar extracts on the death of Synge reveal a very rare depth of friendship and understanding between the two writers.

During the last few years several treatises have appeared in explanation or in criticism of the modern trends in poetry, but most of them have had some axe to grind and have been written with the object of justifying or condemning present-day fashions in versification. Babette Deutsch's *This Modern Poetry* (Faber & Faber, 7/6) is not of this type. The author leaves no doubt that her sympathy is with the moderns; that, after all, is as it should be, for a writer who is out of sympathy with her subject starts out at an obvious disadvantage. But her book is not a partisan one; it seeks to explain, not to justify. To use her own words, "it sets out to trace the development of the verse of the past two decades, to take some account of the forces which have shaped it, and to suggest ways of understanding it." Making due allowance for the war, for modern science and rationalism, and for the inevitable reaction from them which some writers have styled "the modern disillusionment", Miss Deutsch demonstrates that the break with tradition has been much less violent than is generally supposed; that, in fact, a good many of the tendencies which have become such marked characteristics of "modern" poetry were already to be found in embryo in the verse of the late nineteenth century and that, under the stress of social, religious and political conditions on the one hand, and new philosophical conceptions on the other, the development has been quite normal and natural. Holding as she does to this view, her book is not confined, as its title might suggest, to strictly contemporary writers; she starts with the late Victorians, like Hopkins, Hardy and Bridges, while she constantly refers back to Walt Whitman and Edgar Allen Poe. She finishes with the very young writers of today, towards whom she is just as sympathetic as she is towards their older and better known contemporaries. Miss Deutsch brings to her work a critical faculty of unusual acumen, and her reading in modern poetry is amazingly wide. Many American writers with whom the student of English will probably have but a slight acquaintance find a place in her book; but there are also excellent sections on W. B. Yeats, T. S. Eliot, C. Day Lewis, W. H. Auden and Stephen Spender, as well as on the effects of the War on English verse. The book is a most thorough and thoughtful piece of work, but it is not easy to digest, and several readings will probably be required before its import can be fully grasped.

When we come to a consideration of nineteenth and twentieth century prose we find a wealth of material, particularly on the novel of the period, though, naturally, all the contributions are not of equal value. The seventh volume of Dr. E. A. Baker's *History of the Novel* (Witherby, 16/—) deals with the age of Dickens and Thackeray, and like its predecessors is characterised throughout by precision and thoroughness. Dr. Baker refuses to consider the two greatest writers of their day as standing apart from the English literary tradition; rather he regards them as essentially the products of their age, the culmination, as it were, of tendencies which had already manifested themselves in the lesser writers who had preceded them, and in the case of Dickens especially he is at some pains to examine in detail his debt to these predecessors. But he has not confined his attention solely to the greater luminaries; he has sought to do justice also to the lesser figures such as Bulwer Lytton, Disraeli, Peacock, Surtees and a number of others who are rarely read nowadays. To some of them, one feels, he has given more than their due share of attention, but his summary of their achievements and their services to the novel is always illuminating, and in more than one instance he throws out interesting pieces of information about the mental and social atmosphere in which these writers lived.

Another book that is worth careful study is *The English Novelists*, edited by Derek Verschoyle (Chatto & Windus, 8/6), in which nineteen contemporary writers survey the work and achievement of their predecessors. Only the second half of the volume (from Scott onwards) actually falls within the scope of this survey; but it is the better half, including as it does essays on Scott, Peacock, Dickens and Thackeray, the Brontës, Trollope, Meredith, Samuel Butler, Henry James, Thomas Hardy and Joseph Conrad, D. H. Lawrence and Aldous Huxley, James Joyce, E. M. Forster, and Virginia Woolf. In every one there is a good deal of original thought. Mr. Edwin Muir attributes Scott's partial failure as a novelist to the fact that "he was a Scotsman who lived in a particularly dead period of Scottish history ..... The life he knew had no centre." Mr. Sean O'Faoláin accuses Dickens of selling himself to his public and betraying his art, and contrasts him rather unfavourably with Thackeray, while L. A. Povey writes on the realism of Trollope. Two other notable essays are those by Bonamy Dobrée, who reveals Meredith as the supreme example of the novelist of manners, and Catherine Carswell, who regards Samuel Butler as a predecessor of Shaw on the one hand and of Galsworthy on the other — but Galsworthy of *The Island Pharisees*.

The mention of this well known satire on the aristocracy of Edwardian England brings to mind another recent work on the history of prose fiction, *The English Novel from Chaucer to Galsworthy*, by the Rev. R. H. U. Bloor (University Extension Library. Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 4/6), which purports to be a survey of the development of the novel from the Middle Ages to the present day but is spoiled by a lack of proportionate treatment. While some 120 pages are devoted to the predecessors of the novel up to 1700, the whole of the nineteenth century is crushed into less than 50 pages, and even then many important writers are given very scanty treatment or omitted altogether. Hardy, for instance, is consigned to a miscellaneous chapter on minor novelists, and Meredith suffers the same fate. Many modern writers of undoubted talent are noticed only in passing,



while Mr. Bloor's few remarks on Galsworthy are totally inadequate and out of all proportion to his significance. There are a number of suggestive criticisms and judgements in the book, but taken as a whole it cannot be accounted a really successful piece of work. And equally disappointing is Philip Henderson's *The Novel Today* (The Bodley Head, 7/6), where the author proceeds to develop the amazing theory that in the modern world the *raison d'être* of a novel should be the dissemination of Communist propaganda. Mr. Henderson is not altogether without discernment and a stable critical faculty (his observations on authors like James Joyce, D. H. Lawrence and Virginia Woolf are evidence of that) but his main thesis is obviously unsound, since it puts the majority of present-day novelists out of court.

*Inside Out, An Introduction to Autobiography*, by E. Stuart Bates (Basil Blackwell, 21/—) is probably a book unique of its kind. It purports to be a study of the autobiography as a form of literature, and surveys its subject from what, one would think, is every possible angle — types of autobiographical writings, the relation of fact to fiction, the literary and historical elements, the subjective and the objective, the literary and the unsophisticated autobiography and (most important of all) the general characteristic of autobiographical writings as they relate to the various periods of life, from early childhood onwards. From one point of view, that is to say, the book is a study of a person's psychological reaction to his own past; and there is even a closing chapter on "Poetry as Autobiography". But full as it is of interesting observations, Mr. Bates' work is not a conventional academic treatise. The author's method is to take a large number of passages of autobiographical writing (there are, in fact, extracts from 410 books, in 23 different languages)<sup>3</sup> and connect them together by a running commentary. The book thus becomes at one and the same time an anthology and a bibliography of the subject, combined with a good deal of sound criticism and observation. Naturally, the wide scope of the work excludes the possibility of exhaustive treatment, but Mr. Bates has broken a great deal of new ground and has opened up many new avenues for future students of the subject to explore.

Virginia Moore's *The Life and Eager Death of Emily Brontë* (Rich & Cowan, 18/—) is a lengthy study which has obviously involved a great deal of work by an enthusiastic author. Miss Moore has read conscientiously every word Emily Brontë ever wrote and almost every word written about her. She has, she tells us, "visited every earthly place Emily ever lived in or went to in the body, even slept among the hundred year old damp of the Black Bull ... where Emily tapped a warning on the window." And all this "to re-create not a legend, but the irreducible Emily Brontë, unexaggerated, unaltered, unobscured." Unfortunately the result is rather the opposite. We have, it is true, a very highly-coloured picture, with plenty of vivid, dramatic details and by no means devoid of sentimentality. But is it a true picture, "unexaggerated, unaltered, unobscured"? One cannot feel that it is. Miss Moore is far too fond of the sensational and melodramatic, and once she gets an idea into her head she lets her imagination play havoc with facts. Conjecture very soon becomes certainty to her. The very title of the book betrays the spirit in which it is written,

a spirit which may be an asset to a novelist but is a drawback to a biographer. Then again, the author insists on regarding most of the poems and a great deal of *Wuthering Heights* as autobiographical, though what justification she has for this assumption she never makes clear. Nevertheless, many of her conclusions are based upon it. But — most damning indictment of all — she connects Emily's "eager death" with a frustrated love affair and tells us that the man in question was a certain Louis Parensell, whose name appears as the title to a manuscript poem opening

I knew not 'twas so dire a crime  
To say the word Adieu.

This poem was later printed under the title "Last Words". Miss Moore admits that she has been unable to find anything about this elusive Louis Parensell, but she is certain he existed, and she weaves a series of pretty conjectures around him. All this is a little difficult to take seriously; but still, Miss Moore might have "got away with it" had she not made the mistake of printing, in an appendix, a photostat facsimile of the poem in question. Turn to this, and what do we find? Admittedly, the hand-writing is not too clear, but taking into account the content of the poem and the title that was later substituted, it is obvious enough, as an early reviewer of the book pointed out, that the words standing at the head of the manuscript are not "Louis Parensell", but "Love's Farewell"!

A minor contribution to Brontë studies is also made by Miss Irene Cooper Willis in *The Authorship of Wuthering Heights* (Hogarth Press, 3/6), where she contests anew the theory that Branwell Brontë was to a large extent, if not wholly, responsible for the novel usually attributed to his sister. An examination of the structure and style of the work and a comparison with the writings known to have come from the pen of Branwell results in a vindication of Emily Brontë's authorship. Or rather it disproves the claim put forward for her brother, for after having gone thus far Miss Cooper regards her task as finished. Does it follow that if Branwell was not the author it must necessarily have been Emily? Miss Cooper thinks that it does. "That the author was Emily Brontë", she writes, "I have no doubt whatever." But why she has no doubt she never makes clear.

During his life-time Joseph Conrad enjoyed considerable popularity as a novelist: since his death he has been read far less, though several books have appeared which deal with him biographically, and others purporting to explain his character and personality. Edward Crankshaw's *Joseph Conrad, Some Aspects of the Art of the Novel* (The Bodley Head, 8/6) falls into neither of these categories. Rather it is a study of some of the principles underlying Conrad's work and an attempt to relate them to the art and technique of novel-writing generally. Temperamentally, Mr. Crankshaw insists, Conrad was always the aristocrat; he did not believe in philosophising upon life, or "reading a meaning into it"; he just took people and things as he found them. By this, of course, is meant that he was not consciously philosophic or didactic, for Mr. Crankshaw does find a view of life running through all his novels, though none of them are merely the instruments for presenting it to the reader. It is the view that fidelity to things as we find them is the greatest of all virtues; that is the basic conception upon which all of Conrad's most successful characters are

study the individual; but, insists Mr. Crankshaw, he was essentially an objective novelist, who, least of any modern writer, can be identified with his characters. Curiously deficient in inventive power, he took most of his figures from actual life, remoulding and transmuting them to suit his purposes, while he had no use for those writers who could only conceive of their heroes as psychological studies worked out through anything from two hundred to five hundred pages. Mr. Crankshaw is probably right in dwelling upon the sub-conscious influence upon Conrad's art of his Polish antecedents and his early training at sea. Both inclined him towards realism rather than the imaginative or speculative; both contributed to the production of that sense of stoical pessimism which is discernible in all his writings. "Conrad", writes Mr. Crankshaw, "appears to have been oppressed by a sense of evil, and evil to him meant an irresponsible force wandering at large in an ordered and respectable society. There is nothing to be done with it at all. It is a perpetual menace, and the only armour against it is perfect integrity on the part of every member within the gates." This study is a penetrating one, and shows a keenly critical faculty as well as an intimate knowledge and understanding of the novels. It shows how Conrad, by striving merely to present a picture or a story, has provided the material from which everything else — character, personality, style, philosophy, atmosphere — emerges spontaneously.

In the course of some thirty years George Moore passed from an "advanced" writer, who was looked at askance by respectable middle-class folk, to the exponent of a new type of novel which was hailed as the type of the future. Since his death a few years ago several short and incomplete studies have appeared; now comes the first authorised biography, *The Life of George Moore*, by Joseph Hone (Gollancz, 15/-). The author has been unremitting in his search for correspondence, documents, personal reminiscences, and anything that would make his study the fuller, and the result is that not only does the book give a detailed account of Moore's literary career but also a clear picture of his peculiarly complex character and his relations with the other luminaries of the world of letters of his day. Though Mr. Hone makes no attempt to conceal the fascination that women held for him and the part they played in his life, his book certainly does not bear out the strictures of Mr. Yeats. As Mr. Hone saw Moore (and he knew him for a good many years), his one consistent craving was for fame, and when the public was reluctant to accord it him he became something of a cynic and a misanthrope. His lack of a systematic education, too, left its mark on him and led to a certain instability of character well known to his friends; but it was responsible, too, for that independence and originality of outlook in his critical work, which was one of its most salutary qualities.

To students of literature the most interesting part of this book will probably be the final chapter, contributed by Desmond Shaw-Taylor, which deals with Moore's achievements as a writer. Ultimately, declares the author of these pages, his fame will rest on three novels: *Esther Waters*, *The Brook Kerith* and *Hélöise and Abélard*. He traces out the evolution of Moore's prose style, examines his methods of character portrayal, notes his keen insight into the intricacies of personality, as well as his deep sympathy with all his best drawn figures, and comments upon his desire for perfection of form, which he strove consciously and arduously to achieve.



He discerns in his work, too, certain Eastern characteristics, notably the tendency to tell a story rather than to construct a plot after the orthodox fashion. As for his position in the history of the English novel, Mr. Shaw-Taylor does not disguise the fact that he can never hope to become popular even amongst the educated and well read. "His novels", he writes, "will remain, like those of Peacock, a little outside the main stream of English prose fiction". Like Landor, he was definitely a period writer. No doubt he will always have a following, but when the generation that knew him and for whom he wrote has passed away his work will be left only to the connoisseurs.

One of the really outstanding books of the year is undoubtedly G. K. Chesterton's *Autobiography* (Hutchinson, 10/6), which has the merit, rare amongst works of this kind, of being almost a complete record of its author's life from his own pen, since he died while it was still in the press. Now and again Mr. Chesterton is inclined to deviate into religious disputations and apologetics and then his writing becomes a little tedious; but these occasions are comparatively rare. For the most part his pages are characterised by the Chestertonian paradox, wit and humour, by a frankness and joviality and by that charm of style so typical of their author. As an example of self-analysis and self-revelation it is a remarkable piece of writing; as a picture of the author's times it is no less remarkable, while for the light that it throws upon social and political movements of the last forty years it is well worth reading. Chesterton moved in many spheres and met some of the outstanding figures in all of them. His pictures of these people are unconventional enough, revealing aspects of personality which the more formal biographer often misses, for more often than not it was the seemingly trivial things that caught his eye and assumed a significance which threw striking sidelights upon character. W. B. Yeats, St. John Hankin, Will Crookes, Sidney Colvin, W. E. Henley, all make their appearance in these pages; but perhaps the best portrait is that of Hilaire Belloc. And as with his pictures of individuals, so with those of a social class or an age. The first few chapters of the book give an extraordinarily interesting sketch of the late Victorian middle class, with its virtues as well as its vices; but the most extraordinary thing about it is that none of the virtues or the vices are those which we usually associate with it, and Mr. Chesterton attempts to show that what are often accounted shortcomings are in many cases saving graces, misunderstood by a later generation. The author is very modest about his own achievements and self-deprecating about his so-called "genius"; he lays claim to few of the graces or virtues. Strong-headed and uncompromising on some things he may have been, but the impression this book leaves is that of a genial, large-hearted man of the world, wise, gentle and unassuming.

Beside this W. R. Titterton's *G. K. Chesterton, A Portrait* (Alexander Ouseley, 5/—) is an unambitious work, yet it is not without its value as a sketch by a friend and admirer. Once again the creator of Father Brown is set before us as a jovial, good-natured soul (very much the same kind of person that he appears in his own book), who retained to the end the imagination and drollery of a child; but one or two of Mr. Titterton's assertions are not borne out by the autobiography. For instance, in writing of Chesterton's conversion to Roman Catholicism he makes a great deal of the Unitarian influences in his early life, stressing the point and recurring

to it as though it were something crucial; but the autobiography only refers to it in passing. Or again, he does not scruple to describe Chesterton as a journalist rather than an author, and he makes no apologies for so doing; it does not degrade Chesterton; on the contrary it gives an added lustre to journalism, he declares. But Chesterton says that he could never think of himself seriously as a journalist and always wondered why he was tolerated in Fleet Street. On points like these the two writers seem mutually contradictory; and yet perhaps each is right, from his own point of view.

In the field of dramatic studies there has been little work of outstanding merit, and no biographies of dramatists have appeared that seem worth mentioning. In *Early Victorian Drama, 1830-1870* (Cambridge, Heffer, 6/—) Ernest Reynolds attempts to give a comprehensive survey of the dramatic literature of the mid-nineteenth century, relating it to the general spirit of the age as well as to the other branches of contemporary letters. Dr. Reynolds has chosen a somewhat barren field to glean in, and the first half of his period had already been covered in Professor Allardyce Nicoll's *Nineteenth Century Drama, 1800-1850*. Perhaps the most interesting sections are those which deal with stage-lighting, scenery, costuming, and the struggle of the licensed against the unlicensed stage. There is also an excellent bibliography and a useful list of plays based upon contemporary novels.

The research student should also find a very useful and informative reference-book in Rosamond Gilder's and George Freedley's *Theatre Collections in Libraries and Museums* (B. F. Stevens and E. Brown, Ltd., 7/6). It embraces England, America and most of the European countries, giving details of the dramatic resources of their libraries and museums. Special collections and rare editions of plays are noticed, as are also playbills and manuscript material of many kinds, while much useful information about the institutions themselves is given, such as the regulations for photographing materials, etc. The book is by no means exhaustive, for in the case of England alone many small but valuable collections in provincial libraries have been omitted, and there are probably similar omissions in the case of other countries. But for all this, the volume remains one that is indispensable to the serious worker in the fields of drama and theatrical history.

In *The Art of Bernard Shaw* (Oxford University Press, 7/6) S. C. Sen Gupta sets out to explain on the one hand the thought and philosophy of Shaw, and on the other to examine the technique of his plays, relating it to the general principles of dramatic construction. The first part of his book, where he reveals the creator of the Superman as a realist, denouncing sentimentality and cold reason alike, is well written, and written, too, in a spirit of impartiality. Mr. Gupta shows a firm grasp of all the essentials of Shaw's philosophy, as well as a remarkable ability to reduce them to method and order. He has no axe to grind; he is neither a Shavian nor an anti-Shavian, and makes no claim to adjudge the value of the teaching which he explains. The second part, which deals with Shaw as a dramatic artist, is not so happily conceived. One feels that in his protest against the sweeping charges of the anti-Shavians Mr. Gupta has gone to the opposite extreme and has given Shaw credit for a degree of artistic excellence which the average student of his plays will find it difficult to



detect. Still, the book is well worth reading. It is full of suggestive hints which merit consideration, even if they are not always convincing.

Allardyce Nicoll's *Film and Theatre* (Harrap, 7/6) is one of the first works to come seriously to grips with the problem of the relation between the cinema and the stage, and to face fairly and squarely the issue of the possible supersession of the theatre by the film. With characteristic thoroughness and lucidity, Professor Nicoll has examined the technique of both forms of art (for he is emphatic that the film at its best is a form of art), as well as the advantages and limitations of each. He does not share the pessimism that is so commonly expressed about the future of the theatre, for he recognises in the film, not a rival of the stage, but rather an adjunct; and in analysing the attitude of audiences towards these two forms of art he detects an amazing paradox: a stage-play, even if based largely upon fact is always regarded as fiction, but the story told on the screen, extravagant and unreal as it may be, is accepted for reality by nine-tenths of the spectators. He recognises that the film is as yet in its infancy, and admits that there is much about it which can only be deprecated and deplored; but so there was about the early Elizabethan drama, which before long was to produce a Marlowe, a Shakespeare and a Ben Jonson. In short, Professor Nicoll is convinced that under wise guidance, and free from some of the disadvantages imposed upon it by the star system and commercialisation, there are great possibilities before the cinema, and that the theatre should never seek to rival it, since it would be fighting a losing battle from the first. Besides, the function of the stage is not that of the screen. Rather scenic effects, extravaganzas, melodrama, spectacle and the like must be left to the cinema, and the theatre revert to drama in the true sense of the word. It would probably mean its appealing to a cultured, or at least an educated, audience; but that is as it should be. This is a book to be read by all thoughtful students of the drama. It does not, it is true, deal with the literary side of the playwright's art, but its subject is a closely related one; and it has the additional distinction of a very full bibliography — probably the most extensive, in its own particular field, to be found anywhere.

*Memories of John Galsworthy* by his sister, M. E. Reynolds (Robert Hale, 5/—) falls very far short of expectation. As a tribute of love and respect to a great writer from one to whom he was deeply attached it cannot, of course, be criticised, but its value as a study either of Galsworthy or his work is very small. A series of disjointed and fragmentary reminiscences, mostly of a personal nature, fill fifty pages, and then there are some seventy-eight pages of miscellaneous correspondence, most of which is just as unilluminating as the "memories". This is the type of book which should be produced for private circulation only, since its interest is purely a private one. And Vincent O'Sullivan's *Aspects of Wilde* (Constable, 10/—) is almost as unsatisfactory. Mr. O'Sullivan was an acquaintance of Oscar Wilde, who, he feels, has never had justice done him. He sets out to give a faithful picture of Wilde, to clear his character from some of the aspersions and innuendos cast upon it, and to "place him frankly and clearly where he ought to be in the history of English literature". The last part of his intentions he fails to fulfil; as for his attempted vindication of Wilde, it is not completely successful, though one admits that it may be something of a corrective to the picture drawn by Frank Harris. In the story of



Wilde's life he certainly adds fresh information to that we already possessed about his days in Paris, but on the other hand there are many blanks. The book could do with drastic revision.

This covers the more important publications of the year. In conclusion a few minor ones may be noted. An Irish poet very popular in the last century, but comparatively little read in this, is commemorated in Seamus MacCall's *Thomas Moore* (Dublin. The Talbot Press, 2/6), though the book is rather overloaded with digressions on contemporary Irish politics. In *Samuel Butler, the Earnest Atheist* (Eyre and Spottiswoode, 10/6) Malcolm Muggeridge seeks to "debunk" the author of *Erewhon* by exposing his satire as proceeding not from any real spirit of philanthropy or social idealism, but from a strange kind of misanthropy, the outcome of his unhappy relations with his family. Incidentally he shows that the admiration that the young Bernard Shaw professed for Butler was by no means reciprocated, while Festing Jones emerges from his examination as an opportunist rather than the hero-worshipper bent on the vindication of maligned genius. Then there is also *Schooldays with Kipling* by G. C. Beresford (Gollancz, 12/6), a friend's reminiscences of the early life of a poet and novelist who was known wherever the English language was read or spoken. Mr. Beresford was the original of M'Turk of *Stalky and Co.* There may be a little too much of the idolater about his attitude to his subject, but the book is well written and full of interest. Another footnote to literature is also provided in *Carroll's Alice*, by Harry Morgan Ayres (Oxford University Press 10/—), where the author contends that running parallel to the fantasy of *Alice in Wonderland* there is also a serious strain, and that the topsy-turvy world represented by Lewis Carroll is really no more absurd than our own world today, where there is want in the midst of plenty and where so much knowledge and energy is directed to devising means of destruction and death. The parallel is, no doubt, apt enough, but it seems highly improbable that it was intentional. F. B. Millett's *Contemporary British Literature* (Harrap, 10/6) has appeared in a third and considerably enlarged edition, giving a critical survey of 232 authors, with valuable bibliographies, while Mr. Coulson Kernahan's *Five More Famous Living Poets*, originally published in 1928, has now been included in the Key Stone Library (Thornton Butterworth, 5/—). The poets dealt with are W. H. Davies, Walter de la Mare, Sir Owen Seaman, Sir William Watson and Sheila Kaye-Smith. Though some of these are no longer living the original title has been kept, while no attempt has been made to bring the studies up to date. But there is nevertheless a good deal of sound criticism in this volume, as also in its predecessors, *Six Famous Living Poets*, which appears in the same series. Lastly attention should be drawn to an English translation of Professor Michele Renzulli's *Il Peccatore*, a critical biography of Byron. The title is *The Sinner* (New York. The Latin Press), and the price two dollars.

Sheffield.

FREDERICK T. WOOD.

---

### Brief Mention

*Zur Verfasserfrage des Dekkerschen Stückes "The Pleasant Comedy of Old Fortunatus"*. Inaugural-Dissertation, Leipzig. Von HEINZ THIEME. Borna-Leipzig, Noske, 1934. Pp. X—56.

The Admiral's men revived, from February 3rd to May 24th, 1596, "the 1 parte of Fortunatus", author unknown. Nothing is heard of a second part, but during 9-30 November 1599 Dekker received £6 on account of the Admiral's for "the hole history of Fortunatus", followed on December 1st by £1 for altering the book and on December 12th £2 "for the eande of Fortewnatus for the corte". After a brief survey of the various solutions suggested by scholars for the problems of date and authorship of the play, Dr. Thieme takes as a basis for his investigation the influence of Marlowe on the first part of *Fortunatus*. He finds several traces of *Tamburlaine* in the treatment of the allegorical character of Fortune, who in the first part appears tinged with certain characteristics of the Scythian conqueror, such as cruelty, magniloquence, etc., whereas in the second part she does not sway human destinies, but merely arbitrates between Virtue and Vice. In

the analysis of this as well as other Marlovian elements (exoticism, *soif de l'impossible*, Ganymede complex) Dr. Thieme has availed himself of the essay on Marlowe which appeared in *English Studies*, 13 (1931), p. 209 ff. Moreover, the author of the first part has frequent references to mythology, traditional as well as refashioned according to his own invention, and to history, particularly one to Lewis the Meek which is paralleled only by a passage in Greene's *Tritameron of Love*. Greene, in fact, as Dr. Thieme conclusively shows through a minute comparison of details, is the poet of Marlowe's circle to whom can be ascribed the prologue, the song "Fortune smiles, cry holiday", the first appearance of Fortune (lines 89-322), the first choir (ll. 693-732), Fortunatus' visit to the Sultan's court (ll. 733-855), the end of Fortunatus (ll. 1089-1125), the first monologue of Fortunatus (ll. 1-71), Fortunatus' opinion of court life (ll. 1042-1084), the second choir (ll. 1861-1893). This last passage occurs in the second part, which is however conceived in a very different spirit from Greene's aristocratic ideals, cult of Wisdom, and imitation of Lyly's rhetorical style. Dr. Thieme's solution had been already hinted at by E. K. Chambers: "I should not wonder if Greene, who called his son Fortunatus, were the original author". Thieme points out other cases in which Greene gave to his characters names suggestive of their destiny. — M. P.

---

*Literatur- und Kunstkritik in ihren Wechselbeziehungen, ein Beitrag zur englischen (sic) Aesthetik des 18. Jahrhunderts.* Von KARL L. F. THIELKE. Halle, Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1935 (Studien zur englischen Philologie, LXXXIV). Pp. 125. Price M. 4.80.

The sources on which this study is based have often been tapped; the contrast between the classical tradition and the new tendencies (a taste for the Gothic, the picturesque, etc.) which combine together to the making of romanticism has been so frequently emphasized, and by such experts in the appraisal of changing sensibility and new fashions (A. Bosker, K. Clark, Chr. Hussey, E. W. Manwaring, etc.), that Dr. Thielke's contribution has little to add to what every student of pre-romanticism knows almost by heart. Samuel H. Monk's important work on *The Sublime: A Study of Critical Theories in XVIII-Century England*, which appeared in the same year as the book now under review was discussed in *English Studies*, 18 (1936), pp. 226-30. It contains whatever Dr. Thielke has to say, and much more. Were it not that it carries coals to Newcastle, and knocks at an open door, Dr. Thielke's study should be praised for its orderly marshalling of facts, and the art of making the conclusion spring out of a repeated sifting of an easily accessible and plentifully yielding evidence. The conclusion is that both in literature and in art criticism lags behind creative work, and remains tied to time-honoured standards. — M. P.

---

## Bibliography

### HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM

*The Works of Morris and of Yeats in Relation to Early Saga Literature.* By D. M. HOARE. viii + 179 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1937. 6s. net. (A review will appear.)

*Der Englische Modernismus in seinen neuzeitlichen Auswirkungen nach den Werken von Dean Inge.* Von SENTA FRAUCHIGER. (Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, 5.) 120 pp. Zürich & Leipzig: Niehans. 1937. Geh. Fr. 5.—, RM. 3.—. [A review will appear.]

*The Art of Bernard Shaw.* By S. C. SEN GUPTA. xii + 249 pp. London & New York: Oxford University Press. 1936. 7s. 6d. [See Review, p. 284.]

*Sprache und Stil in Katherine Mansfields Kurzgeschichten.* Von W. LANG. (Aus Schrifttum und Sprache der Angelsachsen. Bd. 5.) 57 pp. Leipzig: Noske. 1936. RM. 2.—.



*David-Herbert Lawrence et les récentes idéologies allemandes.* Par E. SEILLIÈRE. (Nouvelle Bibliothèque Littéraire.) xviii + 282 pp. Paris: Boivin & Cie. 1936. 15 fr. [See Review, April 1937.]

*L'Œuvre de D.-H. Lawrence.* Par P. DE REUL. 284 pp. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin. 1937. Price ? [A review will appear.]

*Lytton Strachey.* By GUY BOAS. The English Association Pamphlet No. 93. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 2s.

*Things Past Redress.* By AUGUSTINE BIRRELL. Faber and Faber. 15s.

*T. E. Lawrence.* By CHARLES EDMONDS. Peter Davies. 5s.

*Lawrence of Arabia.* By R. H. KIERNAN. Harrap. 3s. 6d.

*Lawrence.* By EDWARD ROBINSON. Oxford University Press. London: Milford. 3s. 6d.

*Le Théâtre de Somerset Maugham.* Par P. DOTTIN. 264 pp. Paris: Librairie Académique Perrin. 1937. 15 fr. [A review will appear.]

*Virginia Woolf, a Study.* Von R. GRUBER. (Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten, 24.) 100 pp. Leipzig: Tauchnitz. 1935. RM. 6.—. [See Review, Dec. 1936.]

*Die Technik des Bewegungseindrucks in Gedichten Edith Sitwells und Vachel Lindsays.* Von I. GERSTMANN. (Greifswalder Beiträge zur Literatur- und Stilforschung. Heft 13.) 109 pp. Greifswald: Dallmeyer. 1936. RM. 2.80.

*Swinnerton: An Autobiography.* By FRANK SWINNERTON. Hutchinson. 10s. 6d.

*Present Indicative.* By NOEL COWARD. Heinemann. 12s. 6d.

*Distant Fields. A Writer's Autobiography.* By H. A. VACHELL. Cassell. 12s. 6d.

*Zur Technik des englischen Gegenwartsromans.* Von M. BLUMENTHAL. (Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten, 26. Band.) 67 pp. Leipzig: Tauchnitz. 1935. RM. 2.50. [A review will appear.]

*Zwischen Inn und Themse. Lebensbeobachtungen eines Anglisten.* Von A. BRANDL. Mit 18 Tafeln. xiii + 351 pp. Berlin: C. Grote. 1936. Geh. RM. 9.—. [A review will appear.]

*England Heute und Morgen.* Von K. VON STUTTERHEIM. 316 pp. Berlin: Herbig. 1937. RM. 6.80. [See Review, June 1937.]

*An Introduction to English Literature.* By J. H. SCHUTT. Vol. I, Sec. ed. xi + 388 pp. Vol. II, viii + 406 pp. Vol. III, vii + 617 pp. Groningen: Wolters. Vols. I & II, f 4.25 each, cloth f 4.90; vol. III, f 5.90, cloth f 6.50. [See Review, Dec. 1936.]

*Storia della Letteratura Inglese.* Di MARIO PRAZ. 411 pp. Con 80 Illustrazioni e 53 Tavoli Fuori Testo. Firenze: Sansoni. 1937. L. 35.—. [A review will appear.]

*Studi e Svaghi Inglesi.* Di MARIO PRAZ. (Biblioteca Italiana IV.) xiii + 346 pp. Firenze: G. C. Sansoni. 1937. L. 18. [A review will appear.]

*Geschichte der englischen Literatur.* Von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. Von W. F. SCHIRMER. 679 pp. Halle/Saale: Niemeyer. 1937. RM. 18.—. [A review will appear.]

*Der englische Roman zwischen den Jahrzehnten 1927-1935.* Von E. VOWINCKEL. 111 pp. Berlin: Herbig. 1936. RM. 3.50 [See Review, Dec. 1936.]

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

*Grundlinien einer Bibliographie zum Studium der englischen Philologie.* Zum Gebrauch für Vorlesungen und Übungen. Von L. L. SCHÜCKING und W. EBISCH. 24 pp. Leipzig: Englisches Seminar. 1936. RM. 0.40 + porto. [A review will appear.]

*An Index of Bibliographies and Bibliographical Contributions relating to the Work of American and British Authors, 1923-1932.* By NATHAN VAN PATTEN. 9 × 6¼, vii + 324 pp. California: Stanford University Press. London: Milford. 27s. n.

*The Year's Work in English Studies.* Edited for the English Association by FREDERICK S. BOAS and MARY S. SERJEANTSON. Vol. XIII., 1932. 9 × 5¼, 348 pp.; Vol. XIV., 1933. 387 pp.; Vol. XV., 1934. 372 pp.; Vol. XVI., 1935. 380 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 10s. 6d. n. each. [A review will appear.]